The Bhaiṣajyaguru-Sūtra

and

The Buddhism of Gilgit

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

in the Australian National University

1978

by

Gregory Schopen

"The man who builds dykes is not of necessity an anti-irrigationist"

Ezra Pound

This thesis is based on my own research carried out from 1975 to 1978 at the Australian National University.

Abstract.

This work is made up of three unequal parts. The first part contains an edition of the Sanskrit text of what I have called 'Redaction A' of the *Bhaiṣajyaguru-Sūtra*. This edition is based on a single manuscript found at Gilgit, with variants from four other manuscripts, also found at Gilgit, given in the critical apparatus. Stylistically 'Redaction A' seems to represent an 'unrevised' version of the text, perhaps a first attempt *at Gilgit* to commit an oral tradition to writing.

The second part consists of a critical edition of the Tibetan translation of a Sanskrit text of the *Bhaiṣajyaguru-Sūtra*. This edition is based on the Derge, Narthan, Peking and Lhasa versions of the *'phags pa bcom ldan 'das sman gyi bla bai ḍū rya'i 'od kyi sṅon gyi smon lam gyi khyad par rgyas pa* and the *'phags pa de bźin gśegs pa bdun gyi sṅon gyi smon lam gyi khyad par rgyas pa*. The Derge versions form the basis of the edition.

The first and second parts are preliminary studies to the third and main part, since the whole was not intended as a study of the *Bhaiṣajyaguru-Sūtra* per se. This third part is devoted to an English translation of the Sanskrit text, with notes; the latter making up the bulk of the work. In these notes I have attempted to show how a literate member of the Gilgit community, assuming he was familiar with the texts known to have been available to him, would have, or could have, understood the *Bhaiṣajyaguru-Sūtra*. I have also attempted to show what was and what was not unique to the *Bhaiṣajyaguru-Sūtra* vis-à-vis the Gilgit collection as a whole, and to make the first tentative steps towards reconstructing the 'Buddhism' current at Gilgit in the 5th-6th century.

In

Memory of my

Sister

Mary Katherine Schopen Krejci

(1943-1970)

who taught me more

than I really wanted to know

about akālamaraṇa

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.

I think it is fair to say that I looked forward more to writing this 'Acknowledgement' than I did to writing any other piece of the present work. Some, of course, might suggest that that was because it meant that I was finished, and there is some truth in that. But beyond that, I looked forward to it because it would give me a chance to pay my debts - at least in part.

Without wanting to imply that I value institutions above people, my first debt is to the Australian National University for having fed a foreigner for three years. This is a debt I do not take lightly.

I also owe a great deal to Professor J.W. de Jong: for having suggested that I apply for a fellowship at the Australian National University, for supporting the application when it was made, for giving me free use of his library, for lending me his car, for more corrections and suggestions concerning my work - both past and present - than I could ever acknowledge; but perhaps most of all, for letting me go my own way.

To my joint-supervisor, Dr. Tissa Rajapatirana, I also owe much: for daily conversations on almost everything, for lending me 'Louise', for having gone very carefully through the present work, both correcting and proof-reading. I only regret that for so much of my stay in Canberra he was on leave and that many of his suggestions - especially concerning presentation - could not be incorporated into the present work because they came too late. I think the work is the poorer for it.

In terms of the contents of this work, or at least the 'Notes' to the translation which is the part I think is most important, I owe the most to my colleague Paul Harrison. Many of the ideas I was developing as I worked through the material were first tried out on him - during 'Tea', over lunch (this did not help his already sluggish digestion), and occasionally over something stronger. Some of these ideas were abandoned, some modified, and some (he would probably say most) were unchanged: but all, in one way or another, gained by our interaction. He also helped me immensely in

correcting and proof reading the final draft; he supplied me with an inordinately easy prey on the squash court, a ready source of information on bicycles and many other things. As a matter of fact the only regret I have is that I probably won't see him for a long time and that, being born and raised in New Zealand, English was not his native language.

To Betty Kat, who has been for several years the recipient of the Annual Award of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Graduate Students, I owe just about everything: she typed the present thesis (some parts several times) and everything else I wrote in Canberra (except what I wrote in cement behind the Chancellery Annex) - all of it from hand-written copy - she gave me firewood, tomatoes, fruit, flowers, coffee, cigarettes, rides home in the rain, sound advice and directions and lent me money. And the only thing she ever asked in return - which she most certainly will get - was my hat. I will miss her.

I will always be grateful to Dr. Luise (not the same 'Louise' already referred to) Hercus for having introduced me to the *Donkey Digest*, for suggestions on middle-Indian philology, animal husbandry and all things mechanical.

I would like to thank Hisashi Matsumura for the help he gave me with Japanese sources, and for making my stay more fun than it otherwise would have been.

I want to thank Dr. Helmut Loofs and Sigrid, Dr. Tom Harper and Dr. Richard Barz for having lent me their cars.

It will, of course, be obvious by now that I have lived in Canberra for three years and although I never bought a car I was only without one for about five months, and during one period I had three ! This is a good indication of the kind of people I have been lucky enough to know here.

L. and 'Big Mo' already know what I owe them.

CONTENTS

Translation and Notes

THE

BHAIṢAJYAGURU-SŪTRA

*

THE SANSKRIT TEXT OF REDACTION A

FROM GILGIT

"Our life is frittered away by detail".

\- Thoreau -

I. The manuscripts of the Bhaiṣajyaguru-sūtra found at Gilgit.

At least five Mss. of *Bhg* were recovered from Gilgit. Since these are now available in published facsimile there is no need for an elaborate description of the individual Mss., but I must say a few words about the way in which I refer to them. As I have pointed out elsewhere (*IIJ* 19 (1977) 206) Dutt's use of his identifying letters (A, B and C) is so promiscuous as to render them useless. He not only cites the same Ms sometimes as A, sometimes as B or C; he also assigns the letter A to two independent Mss. written in two different scripts. This has resulted in a great deal of confusion in the work that has come after him. Neither Lokesh Chandra in his introductions to the facsimile editions, nor the entries in *Buddhist Text Information*, No. 12 (1977), nor my own note in *IIJ* 19 have succeeded in fully sorting out the situation. This was largely due to the fact that in all three cases there was an attempt to maintain Dutt's original inadequate "system" of letters. In light of this experience, and with the hope of ending this completely unnecessary confusion, I decided to adopt an entirely new system of letters, which I give here along with a few comments. The folio numbers are those assigned to the facsimile by Chandra, *not those of the original Mss.*

V = *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts* viii, no. 32, fols. 1866-1867. This Ms. consists of a single leaf and is the only Ms. of *Bhg* written in what Sander *(Paläographisches zu den Sanskrithandschriften der Berliner Turfansammlung* (Wiesbaden: 1968)*)* calls "Gilgit/Bamiyan Type II". It is one of Dutt's A's.

W = *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts* x, no. 51, fol. 3261. This Ms. consists of a single fragment of a single leaf and had not previously been identified. It is not impossible that W, rather than being an independent Ms., is a fragment of one of the folios missing from the end of Z. The script and handwriting are very close to Z, and the number of lines agrees. This point can only be settled by a careful examination of the originals.

X = *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts* viii, no. 34, fols. 1868-1948. This is virtually a complete Ms. and the only one which preserves a title for our text. Dutt's edition of *Bhg* is essentially an edition of this Ms. It is *usually* referred to by him as B.

Y = *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts* x, no. 10(2), fols. 1394-1425. This Ms. is almost complete, missing only one leaf near the beginning and a small piece at the very end. It forms part of a bundle which also contained the *Vajracchedikā* and this bundle has been discussed in some detail by N.P.Chakravarti, "The Gilgit Text of the Vajracchedikā", in G. Tucci, *Minor Buddhist Texts*, Part I (Rome: 1956) 175-82. It is *usually* referred to as C by Dutt.

Z = *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts* viii, no. 31, fols. 1838-1865. It is missing several folios, and many of those which are preserved are damaged. This is the other Ms. which Dutt refers to as A.

There is one other Ms. which the early inventories and Chandra (*GBM* x, no. 57, fols. 3257-3258) give as a Ms. of *Bhg*. But what I can definitely read of this Ms. - the facsimile is very difficult to read, and my microfilm is, if anything, even worse - does not seem to bear this out. Here again only an examination of the original can settle the question.

Before discussing the relationships between these Mss. it may perhaps be useful to first present a concordance of the material available to us.

Concordance of the Gilgit Mss. of *Bhg*

Paragraph no. of my edition	Dutt's edition page & line	Ms.V	Ms.W	Ms.X	Ms.Y	Ms.Z	Śikṣ
[0]	1.1	-	-	1868.1	1394.1	-	-
[1]	1.2	-	-	1868.2	1394.1	-	-
[2]	1.9	-	-	1869.4	1394.3	-	-
[3]	2.3	-	-	1871.2	1394.6	-	-
[4]	2.9	-	-	1872.5	1395.2	-	-
[5.1]	3.4	-	-	1874.4	1395.5..	-	-
[5.2]	3.9	-	-	(1875.5)*	-	..1838.1	-
[5.3]	4.3	-	-	1876.1	-	1838.1	-
[5.4]	4.7	-	-	1876.5	-	1838.4	-
[5.5]	4.10	-	-	1877.3	-	1839.1	-
[5.6]	4.13	-	-	1878.2	-	1839.4	-

Paragraph	Dutt	Ms.V	Ms.W	Ms.X	Ms.Y	Ms.Z	Śikṣ
[5.7]	5.4		-	1879.1	-	-	-
[5.8]	5.9	-	-	1880.2	-	-	-
[5.9]	5.13	-	-	1881.1	..1396.1	-	-
[5.10]	6.4	-	-	1881.5	1396.1	-	-
[5.11]	6.9	-	-	1883.1	1396.3	-	-
[5.12]	7.1	-	-	1883.5	1396.5	-	-
[5.13]	7.7	-	-	1885.3	1397.1	-	-
[6]	7.11	-	-	1885.5	1397.1	..1840.1	-
[7]	8.10	-	-	1888.4	1397.6	1840.3	-
[8]	10.1	-	-	1892.3	1398.6	1842.5	-
[9]	11.5	-	-	1895.4	1399.6	1844.6	-
[10]	13.3	..1866.1	-	1899.2	1400.5	1846.6..	-
[11]	14.5	1866.2	-	1902.1	1401.4	..1848.1	..175.13
[12]	15.8	1867.2	-	1906.4	1402.5	1849.3	175.14
[13]	15.11	1867.2..	-	1907.2	1402.6	1849.5	-
[14]	17.3	-	-	1911.1	1403.6	1851.5..	-
[15]	19.6	-	-	1916.3	1405.3	..1854.1	..174.1..
[16]	20.10	-	-	1919.4	1406.2*	1855.2	174.7
[17]	23.7	-	-	1925.2	1408.1	1858.6	-
[18]	25.11	-	-	1930.4	1409.4	1861.5..	-
[19]	27.1	-	-	1933.3	1410.3	..1862.1	-
[20]	28.5	-	..3261R..	1936.5	1411.3	1863.3..	-
[21]	29.12	-	..3261L..	1940.3	1412.4..	-	-
[22]	31.11	-	-	1945.1	-	-	-
[23]	32.2	-	-	1946.2	-	-	-
[24]	32.6	-	-	1947.1	-	-	-

[For references marked *, see the critical apparatus to my edition; two dots *before* a reference indicate that the actual beginning of the paragraph is missing from the Ms. in question; two dots *after* a reference indicate that the beginning of the paragraph is preserved, but material coming after it is missing.]

According to Dutt and Chandra two of our Mss., X and Z, are provided with colophons. But judging by the facsimiles it appears not unlikely that the colophons reproduced as *GBMs* viii fols. 1864 and 1948 may have belonged to other Mss. There is at any rate nothing to connect them

definitely with our X and Z. In light of this uncertain situation and in light of the fact that these colophons contain a number of problems best studied in relationship with the other colophons found at Gilgit, I have omitted them from my edition and will not here discuss them further. (For some remarks concerning these and other colophons at Gilgit see: Chakravarti, op.cit., pp.179-82; N.P.Chakravarti, "Hatun Rock Inscription of Patoladeva", *Epigraphia Indica* 30 (1953-54) 226f.; B. Prakash, "Gilgit in Ancient Times", *Bulletin of Tibetology* 7, no.3 (1970) 20f.; Y.Kurumiya, "Hokekyō bonpon shahon okugaku kenkyū nōto", *Hokekyō shinkō no shokeitai* (Kyōto: 1976) 137-38; 146).

II. On the Redactional Differences in the Gilgit Manuscripts of the *Bhaiṣajyaguru-sūtra*.

Determining the relationships between these five Mss. is not easy. We have at our disposal two kinds of evidence: internal evidence, which consists of a large body of variant readings found in the individual Mss., and external evidence. The latter will be dealt with first.

Of the three main Mss., X, Y, and Z, only Y shows no signs of having been "corrected". X has been "corrected" at four places, and Z at fourteen. In almost all cases in both Mss. these "corrections" are interlinear and usually in a different hand. These "corrections" will take on significance if we can determine their source.

In X we find the following instances: ([5.2]1 = paragraph and line number

1875-5: nānādiśāṃ ccheran, to: nānādiśāṃ ga-ccheran. [5.2]1

1883.3: tanidānaṃ pā kurvanti, to: tanidānaṃpā-pam kurvanti [5.11]3

1890.3: yai manuṣyabhūtai śrutaṃ, to: yai pūrvaṃ manuṣyabhūtai śrutaṃ [7]9

1896.1: paspaxx..., to: pa-ra-spaxx... [9]3

For our purposes this evidence is totally inconclusive. 1875.5, 1883.3 and 1896.1 represent obvious corrections which could have been made by any reader. In reference to 1890.3, while it is true that both Y and Z have pūrvaṃ here, and therefore could be the source of the "correction" in X, it is also possible that the correction could have been made on the basis of [9]9 where all three Mss. have pūrvaṃ. Note also that all three Mss. at [8]10, [10]10 and [11]6, in the same basic formula, omit pūrvaṃ.

The analysis of the "corrections" in Z produce more interesting results. We have the following cases:

1839.6: jaḍā kheḷā kā laṃgā kujā, to: jaḍā khelā kā-ṇā laṃgā, etc. [5.6]2. X could not possibly be the source of this correction since it reads: jaḍaitākā-laṃkā kujā; Y is missing.

1840.1: bhaiṣajyaguruprabhasya, to: bhaiṣajyaguru-vaiḍūrya-prabhasya [6]11. An obvious correction which could have been made by any reader.

1841.3: prāg eva mātāpitrīṇāṃ bhāryāputraduhitrīṇāṃ dāsyaṃti prāg eva dāsadāsīkarmakarāṇāṃ prāg evānyeṣāṃ yācanakānāṃ [7]7. The underlining here indicates the corrections; dāsyaṃti is interlinear; the other correction is two lines wedged in a small space which may have been left by an erasure. Y could not be the source of dasyaṃti, although X could; both could be the source for the second and longer correction. The situation is complicated by the fact that Z is the only Ms. which has bhāryāputraduhitrīṇāṃ; X has only prāg eva mātāpitrīṇāṃ dasyanti; and Y has nothing to correspond to either.

1841.5-1842.4: tatra teṣāṃ yamalokasthi-tānāṃ vā tiryagyonisthi-tānāṃ vā tasya tathāgatasya nāma āmukhībhaviṣyati · saha smaraṇa-mā[treṇa ta]taś cavitvā punar api manuṣyaloke upapatsyanti jātismarāś ca bhaviṣyanti · te durgatibhayabhītā na bhūya(ḥ) kāmaguṇebhir bhaviṣyanti · dānābhiratāś ca bhaviṣyanti [7]11-15. Here again the underlining indicates the correction which, again, appears to have been written over an erasure. This correction is virtually identical with the reading of the passage in X, and could not have come from Y, which has quite a different reading.

1845.2: nubhavaṃti · te anekānā varṣaśatasahasrāṇāmm a- [9]3 is added beneath the line, but the usual '+' indicating where it should be inserted is missing, probably due to the fragmentary nature of the first two lines. In any case, this 'correction' could have come from either X or Y, both having essentially the same reading.

1845.4: vamānā, to: va-ha-mānā [9]6. An obvious correction.

1847.4: pṛthagbhūtānāvāhayanti, to: pṛthagbhūtānā-mā-vāhayanti [10]6. In reference to the gen.pl. ending, the reading of Z, which is exactly the same reading as X, has been changed to the reading

of Y. Note, however, that Y reads pṛthakpṛthagbhūtā-, while X and Z have only pṛthagbhūtā-.

1850.2: ka(p)xx.., to: ka-ṛṇa-(pu)xx [13]5. An obvious correction.

1851.5: na ca kenacic chakyam ojopahati · bhagavān āha etc., to: na ca kenacic chakyam ojopahati · hṛtaṃ vā ojah puṇnaḥ pratyāharati bhagavān āha, etc. [13]15-16. Here the correction is virtually the same as the reading of Y, and X could not possibly be the source, since it shows a different reading.

1852.2: -samanvāgatam upavasitavyaḥ, to: -samanvāgata-m upavāsa-m upavasitavyaḥ [14]4. This correction could have been made on the basis of either X or Y.

1852.3: praveśe, to: pra-de-śe [14]5. An obvious correction.

1853.6: svapnaṃ śyanti, to: svapnaṃ pa-śyanti [14-16. An obvious correction.

1854.6: janayiṣyati bhirūpa, to: janayiṣyati a-bhirūpa [15]14. This co r ction is the reading of X; Y has -iṣyanty abhirūpam.

1858.5: na tv e tasya, to: na tv e-va tasya [16]28. An obvious correction.

Here again the evidence is not conclusive, but it does indicate a few possibilities. It indicates, for example, that the 'corrections' in Z could not have been made on the basis of either X or Y alone. This in turn suggests at least two possibilities: (1) the 'corrections' in Z were made by someone who compared it with both X and Y, and thus in terms of the 'corrections' Z represents a conflated Ms; or (2) the 'corrections' in Z were based on another Ms, no longer extant, which contained readings which sometimes agreed with X, and sometimes agreed with Y. This hypothetical Ms., however, would appear on the basis of its readings to have been itself a conflated Ms. Both possibilities seem to indicate that in terms of the 'corrections' alone, Z represents a conflated Ms. tradition which is to be placed somewhere between X and Y. As we will see below, this pattern conforms very closely to that which emerges from an analysis of the internal evidence.

The internal evidence available to us is in quantity, at least, much richer, although here again a precise analysis of it is not easy. I think it is clear from the material that in the three main Mss. we have at least

two, and probably three, separate redactions of our text. But here already we have a problem: it is one thing to state that we have two, or probably, three redactions of our text, but it is quite another thing to give a precise definition of what constitutes a legitimate redactional difference. A large part of the problem is that we lack parallel examples from other texts, since almost all our Mahāyāna texts in Sanskrit are preserved in only one, usually late, Nepalese redaction. When the Kashgar Ms. of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* is fully studied and compared with the Gilgit/Nepalese version of the text we may, however, know more about the nature and possible range of redactional variation, especially in regard to prose composition which is not governed by the conservative influence of meter. Apart from the *Saddharma*, we already know that there are considerable differences, notably in prose, between the Gilgit and Nepalese redactions of the *Samādhirāja-sūtra*, but these differences have yet to be analysed. The only other example that I know of - and the one which is perhaps most comparable to *Bhg* - is that of the *Vajracchedikā*, where we have both an early Gilgit/Central Asian redaction(s) and a later redaction preserved in Mss. from Japan. But here again, the variations have not yet been systematically studied and are imperfectly marked in Conze's edition. In light of this lack of comparable material - and therefore of anything like established criteria - the best method of procedure seems to be a definition-by-enumeration. That is to say, that it is best to begin, at least, with an enumeration of examples of what appear to be legitimate redactional differences.

In the table below the numbers in square brackets refer to paragraph numbers in my edition. I have also added in parentheses after each reading the letter or letters of the Ms./Mss. in which it is to be found. It should be noted that when a reading is assigned to two or more Mss., this does not necessarily mean that both Mss. have *exactly* the same reading. There are often minor differences in tense, spelling, etc. Readings under 'Redaction A' are those of my edition and do not, therefore, necessarily correspond *exactly* to Y or Z, etc. Those under 'Redaction B' are unedited; I have merely added missing letters when necessary.

Redaction A	Redaction B
[1]a. bhagavāṃ ... vaiśālīm anuprāpto viharati sma. (Y)	a. bhagavāṃ ... nupūrveṇa yaina vaiśālīṃ mahānagariṃ · tenānuprāpto bhūt tatra khalu bhagavānn vaiśālyāṃ viharati sma. (X)

Redaction A	Redaction B
b. devāsuragaruḍakinnaramahoragaiḥ (Y)	b. mahatyā ca devanāgayakṣaṅgandharvāsuragaruḍakiṃnnaḥramahoraga-manuṣyāmanuṣyaparṣadā (X)
[2]a. ekāṃsaṃ cīvaraṃ prāvṛtya (Y)	a. ekām[sam uttarā]saghaṃ kṛtvā (X)
[3]a. satvānām arthāya hitāya sukhāya devamanuṣyāṇāṃ (Y)	a. satvānām arthāya hitāya sukhāya devamanuṣyāṇāṃ ca hitārthāya (X)
[4]a. śāstā devamanuṣyāṇāṃ (Y)	a. śāstā devānāṃ ca manuṣyāṇāṃ ca (X)
b. tasya maṃjuśrīr bhagavato, etc. (Y)	b. tasya khalu puna maṃjuśrīr bhagavato, etc. (X)
c. pūrve (Y)	c. pūrvaṃ (X)
d. katamāni dvādaśāni (Y)	d. katamāni dvādaśamahāpraṇidhānāni (X)
[5.1]a. buddhabodhim abhisaṃbudhyeyaṃ (Y)	a. (i)nu[ttar]āyāṃ samyaksaṃbodhim abhisaṃbudhyeyaṃ (X)
b. tadāprameyāsaṃkhyeyāparimāṇā lokadhātavo mama śarīrābhayā bhrājeraṃs (Y)	b. tadā mama śarīr(x)xxxx-prameyāsaṃkhyeyāparimāṇā lokadhātavo bhrājeraṃ (X)
[5.4]a. 'haṃ kum[ārgaprati]pannāḥ satvā bodhimārge pratiṣṭhāpayeyaṃ, śrāvakamārgapratipann[āḥ pratyekabuddhamā]rgapratipannā vā sarve mahāyāne niyojya pratiṣṭhāpaye[yaṃ] (Z)	a. 'haṃ ye kumārgapratipannānāṃ satvānāṃ · śrāvakaxxkabuddhapratipannāś ca te satvā anutare bodhimārge mahāyāne niyojayeyaṃ (X)
[5.5]a. tathā cānye aprameyāsaṃkhyeyāparimāṇā satvās te sa[r]v[e] akhaṇḍaśīlā syuḥ (Z)	a. te sarve akhaṇḍaśīlā syūs (X)
b. mā ca kasyaci śīlavipannasya mama nāmadheyaṃ śrutvā durgatigamanaṃ syāt (Z)	b. mā ca kasyaci śīlav[i]pannasya mama nāmadheyaṃ śrutvā mā kaci durgatigamanaṃ syāt (X)
[5.9]a. [... 'haṃ sarvasatvā māra]pāśaiḥ parimocayeyaṃ nānādṛṣṭigahanasaṃkaṭaprāptāḥ tān samyagdṛṣṭyāṃ pratiṣṭhāpayeyaṃ (Y)	a. 'haṃ sarvasatvā mārapāśabandhanabaddhā nānādṛṣṭigahanasaṃkaṭṭaprāpta--sarvamārapāśadṛṣṭigatibhyo vinivartya samyagdṛṣṭau niyojyā (X)
[5.10]a. ye ca bandhanatāḍanāvaruddhā (Y)	a. ye vā bandhanabaddhāvaruddhā (X)

b. te madīyena puṇyānubhāvena parimucyeran sarvopadravebhyaḥ (Y)

b. te mama nāmadheyaṃ śravaṇā madīyena puṇyānubhāvena sarvabhayopadravebhya(ḥ) parimucyeran (X)

[5.11]a. āhāraparyeṣṭyabhiyuktāḥ pāpaṃ karma kurvanti ahaṃ teṣāṃ varṇagandharasopetenāhārena śarīraṃ santarpayeyaṃ paścā dharmarasenātyantasukhe pratiṣṭhāpayeyaṃ (Y)

a. āhārapānaparyeṣṭyabhiyuktāḥs tanidānaṃ pāpaṃ kurvanti sace te mama nāmadheyaṃ dhārayeyur ahaṃ teṣāṃ varṇagandharasopetenāhārena śarīraṃ santarpayeyu(r) (X)

[5.12]a. dvādaśaman tasya tathāgatasya idaṃ mahāpraṇidhānam a(bhūt) (Y)

a. dvādaśamaṃ tasya mahāpraṇidhānaṃ abhūt (X)

b. śītoṣṇadaṃśamaśakai rātriṃdivaṃ duḥkhāṃ vedanāṃ vedanti (Ms. viṃdya) ahaṃ teṣāṃ vastraparibhogaṃ upanāmayeyaṃ (Y)

b. śītoṣṇadaṃśamaśaker upadrutā tṛndrivaṃ duḥkhaṃ anubhavanti sace te mama nāmadheyaṃn dhārayeyur ahaṃ teṣāṃ vas[t]raparibhogam upasaṃhareyaṃ (X)

[7]a. aneke ca te satvā ye svayam evātmana na paribhuṃjanti prāg eva dāsadāsīkarmakarāṇāṃ prag evānyeṣāṃ yācanakānāṃ (Y)

a. X: aneke ca satvā ye svayam eva na paribhuṃjati prāg eva mātāpitrīṇāṃ dāsyanti prāg eva dāsadāsīkarmakarāṇāṃ (prā)g evānyeṣāṃ yācanakānāṃ

a. Z: anekāni ca satvāni svayam evātmanā na paribhuṃjanti prāg eva mātāpitrīṇāṃ bhāryāputraduhitrīṇāṃ (dāsyaṃti) prag eva, etc.

b. tatra teṣāṃ yamaloke sthitānāṃ vā tiryagyonau sthitānāṃ vā tasya tathāgatasya nāma āmukhībhaviṣyati. saha smaritamātreṇa tataś cyutvā punar api manuṣyaloke upapatsyanti, jātismarās ca bhaviṣyantidurgatibhayabhītā na bhūyaḥ kāmaguṇair arthikā, dānābhiratāś dānasya ca varṇavāditāḥ sarvāstiparityāgino 'nupūrveṇa śīrṣakaracaraṇanayanasvamāṃsaśoṇitaṃ yācanakānāṃ pradāsyanti (Y)

b. tatra teṣāṃ yamalokasthitānāṃ tiryagyonisthitānāṃ vā tasya tathāgatasya nāma āmukhībhaviṣyati saha smaraṇamātreṇa taś cavitvā punar api manuṣyaloke upa[pa]tsyate jātismarāś ca bhaviṣyati·te ca durgatibhayabhītā na bhūyoḥkarmaguṇebhir a[r]thikā bhaviṣyati dānābhiratāś ca bhaviṣyati dānasya ca varṇavādina·sarvāstiparityāgina·anupūrveṇa karacaraṇaśīrṣanayanasvamāṃ[sa]śoṇitaṃ yācanakānāmm anupradāsyati (X,Z)

[8]a. santi satvā ye tathāgatānam uddiśya śikṣāpadaṃ dhārayanti, śīlavipannā ācāravipannāḥ dṛṣṭivipannā; ye punaḥ śīlavantaḥ te śīlaṃ rakṣanti na bāhuśrutyaṃ paryeṣanti na ca tathāgatānāṃ sūtrāntānāṃ gambhīraṃ arthaṃ vijānanti (Y)	a.X: santi satvā ye tathāgatān udiśya· śikṣāpadāni dhārayati te śīlavipat[t]im āpadyate dṛṣṭivipat[t]im ācāravipat[t]im vā·kadācid āpadyate śīlavipan[n]ā ye ye puna śīlavanto bhavati śīlaṃ rakṣati·na puna bahuśrutaṃ paryeṣanti na ca tathāgatabhāṣitānāṃ sūtrāntānāṃ gabhīram artham ājānati a.Z: santi satvā ye tathāgatānāṃm uddiśya śikāpadāni·te śīlavipatim āpadyate dṛṣṭvipattim ācā[ra]vipatti vā kādācid āpadyante·te śīlavipannāḥ ācāravipannāḥ driṣṭivipannā y[e] [pu]naḥ śīlavantaḥ te śīlaṃ rakṣanti, etc.
b. yai śrutaṃ bhaviṣyati tasya bhagavato bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya nāmadheyaṃ (Y,Z)	b. tatra yes tasya bhagavato bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya nāmadheyaṃ śrutaṃ bhaviṣyati (X)
c. tathāgatānāṃ śāsane pravrajitvānupūrveṇa bodhisatvacārikāṃ cariṣyanti (Y, probably Z)	c. tathāgataśāsane pravrajitvānupūrveṇa bodhisatvacārikāṃ paripūrayiṣyanti (X)
[9]a. yaiḥ śrutaṃ pūrvaṃ manuṣyabhūtais tasya bhagavato bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya nāmadheyaṃ (Y,Z)	a. ye (rd.yaiḥ) pūrvaṃ manuṣyabhūtais tasya bhagavato bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya nāmadheyaṃ śrutaṃ bhaviṣyati (X)
b. cchindanti mārapāśaṃ bhindanti vidyāṇḍakośaṃ ucchoṣayanti kleśanadīṃ parimucyanti jātijarāmaraṇaśokaduḥkhadaurmanasyopāyāsebhyaḥ (Y, and generally Z)	b. mārapāśa bhindya vidyāṇḍakośaṃ ucchoṣayati ·kleśanadīm ucchoṣayati· jātijarāvyādhimaṇaṇaxxśokaparidevaduḥkhadaurmanasyopāsebhyaḥ (X;Z follows X only in inserting -vyādhi- and -parideva-).
[10]a. śarīravināśaṃ vā kartukāmā; yai śrutaṃ bhaviṣyati tasya bhagavato bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya nāmadheyaṃ (Y)	a. śarīrādhikṣepaṃ vā kartukāmā yai punas tasya bhagavato bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya nāmadheyaṃ śrutaṃ bhaviṣyati (X, and probably V)

b. avyāpādacittā viharanti (Y)	b. avyāpannacit[t]ā viharati (X,V)
[11]a. yaiḥ punaḥ śrutaṃ bhaviṣyati tasya bhagavato ... tathāgatasya nāmadheyaṃ (Y, Śikṣ)	a. yai punas tasya bhagavate ... tathāgatasya nāmadheyaṃ śrutaṃ bhaviṣyati (X,V)
b. te tataś cyutveha manuṣyaloke rājāno bhaviṣyanti (Y,Śikṣ)	b. te taś cavitvā (X only) iha manuṣyaloke upapatsyate rājāno bhaviṣyati (X,Z,V)
c. te rūpasaṃpannā aiśvaryasaṃpannā parivārasaṃpannā śūrā vīrā mahānagnabalavegadhāriṇo bhaviṣyanti (Y)	c. t(e) rū[pa]saṃpannāḥś ca bhaviṣyati·aiśvaryasaṃpan[n]āś ca bhaveyuḥ parivārasaṃpannāś ca bhaviṣyati · śūrāś ca vīrāś ca·mahāvalavegadhāriṇāś ca bhaviṣyati (X,V, probably Z,Śikṣ)
[12] yena punar mātṛgrāmeṇa tasya tathāgatasya nāmadheyaṃ śrutaṃ bhaviṣyati udgṛhītaṃ sa tasya paścimo mātṛgrāmabhāvaḥ pratikāṃkṣitavyaḥ (Y,Z,Śikṣ)	V: yaś ca mātṛgrāmas tasya tathāgatasya (nāmo)dgṛhīṣyaṃti tasya eva paścimaka strībhāvaḥ pratikāṃkṣitavyaḥ X: yaś ca mātṛgrā(x)ma tasya bhagavato bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya nāmadheyaṃ śrutvāṃ codgṛhīṣyanti tasya sa eva paścimastrībhāva pratikākṣitavya(ḥ)
[13]a. buddhanāmaṃ karṇapuṭeṣūpasaṃhariṣyāmi (Y)	a. buddhānāṃ nāma karṇapuṭe nipatiṣyati (V, and probably X,Z)
b. sūtraṃ dhārayiṣyanti (Y,V)	b. sūtraratnaṃ dhārayiṣyanti (X,Z)
c. pustakalikhitaṃ vā satkariṣyanti (Y)	c.X: pustakagataṃ vā kṛtvā saṃskariṣyanti; V: pustakagataṃ vā satkariṣyaṃti; Z: ..xxstakagataṃ satkariṣyanti
d. nānāpuṣpamālyagandhavilepanacūrṇacīvaracchatradhvajapatākābhiḥ (Y)	d. nānāpuṣpadhūpagandhamālyavilepanacchatradhvajapatākābhi (V,X and probably Z)
e. pariveṣṭayitvā (Y)	e. pariveṣṭya (V,X)

f. devatākoṭīśatasahasrāṇy upasaṃhariṣyaṃti (Y)	f. devakoṭīnayutaśatasahasrāṇi tatropasaṃkramiṣyanti (V,X, and probably Z)
g. yemaṃ sūtraṃ dhārayiṣyanti tasya bhagavato bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya nāmadheyaṃ pūrvapraṇidhānaviśeṣavistaraṃ ca (Y, and probably Z)	g. te ca bhagavaṃn imaṃ sūtraratnaṃ dhārayiṣyanti tasya bhagavato bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya pūrvapraṇidhānaviśeṣavistaravibhagaṃ tasya tathāgatasya nāmadheyaṃ dhārayiṣyati (X,V, although V ends after the first tathāgatasya)
h. na ca kenacic chakyam ojopahartuṃ Z: -opahati), hṛtaṃ vā ojaḥ punaḥ pratyāharanti (Y,Z. The 2nd clause in Z is added in another hand below the line.)	h. na cāsya kenacic chakya ojam ahātuṃ hṛtaṃ vā ojaḥ punar api pratisaṃharati (X)
[14]a. bhagavān āha evam etad maṃjuśrī tathā yathā vadasi (Y and probably Z)	a. bhagavāṃm āhaivam eta maṃjuśrī evam eta tadyathā vadasi
b. nirmalacittenākaluṣacittenāvyāpādacittena bhavitavyaṃ (Y)	b. X: nirmalacit[t]enākaluṣacit[t]ena sarvasatveṣu maitracit[t]ena sarvasatvānām antike samacit[t]ena bhavitavyaṃ. b. Z: nirmalacittenākaluṣacittena āvyāpādacittena maitracittena sarvasatveṣu hitacittena bhavitavyaṃ karuṇācittena muditācittena upekṣācit[t]ena samacittena bhavitavyaṃ
c. idaṃ sūtraṃ prakāśayitavyaṃ (Y)	c. idaṃ ca sūtraṃ pravartayitavyāṃ (X; Z omits the phrase entirely).
d. yady aiśvaryam prārthayayanty alpakṛcchreṇa labhanti, yadi putrābhilāṣiṇo bhavanti putralābhaṃ pratilabhante. ye pāpakaṃ svapnaṃ paśyanti yatra vāyasaḥ sthito bhavati, durnimittaṃ vā paśyanti yatra sthāne śataṃ alakṣmīṇām upasthito bhavati,	d. yady aiśvaryam abhiprāhrthayati alpakṛcchena prāpnoti, [ya]di putrābhilābhī bhavati putrapratilābhaṃ pratilabhate · ye pāpakaṃ svapnaṃ paśyati · yatra vāya st[h]itā bhavati · drunimit[t]aṃ vā sthitaṃ bhavati · tais tasya bhagavato bhaiṣajyaguru-

te tasya bhagavato bhaiṣajyaguru-vaidūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya nānā-prakāreṇa pūjābhisaṃskāraṃ kurvanti sarvaduḥsvapnadurnimittaṃ cāmaṃgala-bhāvā na paśyanti. yeṣām agnibhayaṃ udakabhayaṃ caṇḍahastibhayaṃ siṃha-vyāghrabhayaṃ ikṣatarakṣāśīviṣa-vṛścikaśatapādabhayaṃ tais tasya tathāgatasya pūjā kartavyā (Y and probably Z, although like X it reads abhiprārthayati and unlike Y or X it reads tad alpakṛcchreṇa and putra pratilabhate; it ends at durnimittaṃ vā paśya...)

vaiḍūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya pūjā kartavāṃ sarvadu[h]svapnadurnimit[t]-āmaṃṅgalyāś ca bhāvā praśamiṣyati · yasām agnyamudakaviṣa śastrapradāta· caṃṇḍahastisiṃgha-vyāghrarikṣata-rakṣadvīpikā·āśīviṣavṛścikaśatapāda daṃśamaśakādhibhayaṃ na bhavati tena tasya tathāgatasya pūjā kartavy(ā) (X)

[15]a.ye-yathā parigṛhītāḥ śikṣāsaṃvarā tato 'nyatarānyataraśikṣāpada-bhraṣṭā bhavanti durgatyapāyabhaya-bhītā, ye tasya bhagavato bhaiṣajya-guruvaiḍūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya namasyanti pūjāṃ kurvanti, na teṣāṃ tryapāyaduḥkhaṃ pratikāṃkṣitavyaṃ (Y, but the final clause is taken from Z)

a. ye ca yathāparigṛhītāc chikṣāsaṃvarād anyatarāc chikṣāpadād bhraṣṭā bhavanti / sacet te durgatibhayabhītās tasya bhagavato bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūrya-prabharājasya tathāgatasya nāmadheyaṃ dhārayeyur yathāvibhavataś ca pūjāṃ kuryuḥ (X has only nāmadheyaṃ dhārayeyur) / na bhūyas teṣām apāyagatiḥ pratikāṅkṣitavyā (X and Śikṣ)

a. ......padāsaṃvārā tato 'nyatarān-yatarāc chikṣāpadād bhraṣṭā bhavanti· te durgati apāyabhītā ye tasya bhaga-vato bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya pūjāṃ kurvanti na teṣāṃ tryapāyaduḥkhaṃ pratikāṃkṣitavyaṃ (Z)

b. yaḥ kaścit mātṛgrāmaḥ prasavana-kāle atīvatīvrāṃ duḥkhāṃ vedanāṃ vedayati, yas tasya bhagavato bhaiṣaj-yaguruvaiḍūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya namasyati pūjā ca kurvati śīghraṃ parimucyati, (Z, and probably Y)

b. yaś ca mātṛgrāma prasavanakāle tīvrāṃ duḥkhāṃ kharāṃ kaṭṭukāṃ vedanāṃ vedayati yas tasya bhagavato bhaiṣaj-yaguruvaiḍūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya nāmadheyaṁ anusmare pūjā ca kuryu·sa sukhaṃ ca prasvayate (X)

c. na tasya śakyam amānuṣeṇa ojo grahītum (Z)

c. na ca śakyate-m-ojopahartum (X)

[16]a. tathāgatasya·arhataḥ samyaksaṃbuddhasya guṇānuśaṃsān varṇayisyāmi (Y,Z)	a. tathāgatasya guṇān varṇayiṣyāmi (Śikṣ: varṇa,āmi) (X, Śikṣ)
b. na me bhadanta bhagavan (Y,Z, Śikṣ) kāṃkṣā na vimati na vicikitsā vā tathāgatabhāṣiteṣu dharmeṣu (Y)	b. na me atra (X) kāṃkṣā na (Z,Śikṣ: vā) vimatir vā vicikitsā vā tathāgatabhāṣiteṣu sūtrānteṣu (X,Z,Śikṣ)
c. apariśuddhakāyavāṅmanaḥsamudācāraḥ (Y,Z)	c. °-samudācāratā (X, Śikṣ)
d. sūryacandramasau...pṛthivyāṃ nipateyuḥ (Y,Z)	d. candrasūryāv...pṛthivyāṃ prapateta (Śikṣ: patetām) (X,Śikṣ)
e. parvatarājā sthānāt saṃkramet (Y,Z)	e. parvatarājā sthānāc calet (X,Śikṣ)
f. teṣām evaṃ bhavati (Y,Z,Śikṣ)	f. evaṃ vakṣyanti (X)
g. nāmadheyasmaraṇamātreṇa (Y,Z)	9. nāmadheyam anusmaraṇamātreṇa (X,Śikṣ, but the latter without anu-)
h. ettakā guṇānuśaṃsā (Y,Z,Śikṣ)	h. tāvanto guṇānuśaṃsā (X)
i. anarthāyāhitāyāsukhāya vinipātāya (Y,Z,Śikṣ)	i. [ana]rthāya na hitāya na sukhāya vinipātāya (X)
j. yeṣāṃ tasya tathāgatasya nāmadheyaṃ karṇapuṭe nipateta (Y,Z)	j. yenas tasya tathāgatasya nāmadheyaṃ śrutaṃ (X) j. yeṣāṃ tasya nāmadheyaṃ nipatet karṇe (Śikṣ)
k. asthānam ānandānavakāśo ... yat tasya durgatyapāyagamanaṃ bhavet (Y,Z,Śikṣ)	k. aḥsthānam ānandānavakāśo ... ya tasya satvasya durgatigamanaṃ bhaven nedaṃ sthānaṃ (vidyate) (X)
l. kalpena vā kalpāvaśeṣeṇa vā (Y) bodhisatvacārikā vistareṇa samprakāśayeyaṃ (Y,Z)	.l. kalpaṃ vā kalpāvaśeṣaṃ vā (X,Z) bodhisatvacārikāyā vistaravibhaṅgaṃ nirdeśeyaṃ (X)
[17]a. tena ca punaḥ samayena tasminn eva parṣadi (Z: tatra pariṣāyāṃ) trāṇamukto ... mahāsatvaḥ sa ut..yāsanād ekāṃsaṃ cīvaraṃ prāvṛtya (Y,Z)	a. tena khalu puna samaye tasyām eva parṣadi trāṇamukto ... mahāsatva sannipatito bhūt·sanniṣaṇṇaḥ sa usthāyāsanād ekāṃsam ut[t]arāṃ saṃgaṃ kṛtvā (X)

b. yā ca tasya puruṣasya sahajā pṛṣṭ[h]ānubaddhā devatā, yat tena kuśalaṃ vā akuśalaṃ vā kṛtaṃ bhavet tac ca sulikhitam kṛtvā (Y)

b. yaś ca ·asya satvasya sahajānuvaddhā devatā syā yatkiṃci tena puruṣena kuśalam akuśalaṃ bā kṛtaṃ bhavati ta sarvaṃ sulikhitaṃ kṛtvā (X)

c. ye tasya bhagavato bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya śaraṇaṃ gamiṣyanti tasyāturasyārthāyedṛśena prayogena pūjāṃ kurvanti (Y, and Z except that after gamiṣyanti it has tena tasyāturasyāxxxśena prayogena pūjā kartavyā)

c. tatra xx te mitrajñātisālohitāsās tasya turasyārthāya taṃ bhagav(x)x bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabhaṃ tathāgataṃ śaraṇaṃ gaccheyus tasya tathāgatasya pūjāṃ kuryu (X)

d. navacatvāriṃśatime (Y,Z)

d. ekonapaṃcāśatime (X)

e. tasya tathāgatasya pūjā kartavyāḥ (Y, probably Z)

e. tasya bhagavato bhaiṣajyaguruxxryaprabhasya tathāgatasya·nāmadheyaṃ dhārayetavyaṃ·yathā saṃvidyamānā ca pūjāṃ kartavyā (X)

[18]a. athāyuṣmān ānandas trāṇamuktasya bodhisatvasyaivam āha (Y)

a. athāyuṣmān ānandas trāṇamuktam nāma bodhisatvamm etad avocat (X)

b. sapta rātriṃdivasam aṣṭāṃgasamanvāgatam upoṣadhasaṃvaraṃ gṛhītavyaṃ (Y)

b. sapta divasāny āryāṣṭāṃgasamanvāgatam upavāsa(m) (u)pavāsitavya (X)

c. triṣkṛtvā rātrau triṣkṛtvā divase tasya bhagavato bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya namasyitavyam (Y)

c. ca bhaga(vato) bhaiṣajyaguru[vaiḍūrya]prabhas tathāga trṣkritvā rātrau trṣkṛtvā divasau namaskaxx... (X)

d. navacatvāriṃśad dīpāḥ pradīpitavyāḥ, sapta pratimā kartavyāḥ, ekaikāyā pratimāyāḥ sapta sapta dīpāḥ sthāpayitavyāḥ (Y)

d. ekonapaṃcāśa dīpā prajvālayitavyā sapta pratimā kartavyā ekaikayā pratimayā sapta dīpā prajvālayitavyā (X)

e. yadi navacatvāriṃśatime divase āloko na kṣīyate paṃcaraṃgikāś ca patākā navacatvāriṃśad dṛṣṭikā(?) kartavyāḥ (Y)

e. yady ekonaxxxxxdivase āloko na kṣīyate veditavyāṃ sarvasampad iti paṃcaraṃgikāś ca patākā ekonapaṃ(cāṃ)xkta kartavyā (X)

[19]a. vyādhipīḍā vā svacakraparacakrapīḍā vā nakṣatrapīḍā vā nakṣatragrahapīḍā vākālena vātavṛṣṭipīḍā vā anāvṛṣṭipīḍā vā (Y, perhaps Z)	a. vyādhipīḍā vā svacakrapīḍā [vā pa]racakrapīḍā vā candragraxxxgra(ha)pīḍā vā axxxpīḍā vā (X)
b. bandhanagatā mokṣitavyā (Y)	b. bandhanagatāś ca satvā mo(ca)yitavyā (X,Z)
c. tathāgatasya tādṛśā pūjā kartavyā yathāpūrvoktā (Y,Z)	c. tathāgatasya yathāp[ū]rvoktā pūjā karaṇīya tax(ā) (X)
d. pūrvapraṇidhānaviśeṣeṇa (Y,Z)	d.pūrvapraṇidhānaviśeṣavistareṇa (X)
e. kālena vātavṛṣṭisasyaṃ saṃpatsyati (Y)	e. kālena vātavṛṣṭisasyasaṃpadā (bhavi.)ṣyati (X)
[20]a. ānandas trāṇamuktasyaivam āha (Y,Z)	a. ānando trāṇamuktaṃ bodhi(satvam) e(tad av)o(cat) (X)
b. santi navākālamaraṇāni tena mantrauṣadhiprayogā upadiṣṭā (Y,Z)	b. sa[n]ti na[vā]kālamaraṇāni teṣāṃ pratikṣepeṇa satrau- (rd: mantrau-)-ṣadhiprayogā upadiṣṭā (X)
c. yadi vā vaidyā abhaiṣajyaṃ kurvanty etad prathamam akālamaraṇam (Y)	c. yadi vā vaidyābhaiṣajyaṃ xx nidānaṃ k[ālaṃ] ku[rvan]t[i] [i]daṃ [pratha](m)[aṃ]m akālamara[ṇaṃ] (X)
d. ye siṃhavyāghrasṛgālavyāḍacaṇḍamṛgamadhyagatā bhavanti (Y)	d. ye··vyāghravyāḍacaṃṇḍamṛgamadhyagatā vāsāṃ kalpayati marati (X)
e. ete saṃkṣepeṇa mahantā akālamaraṇā nava tathāgatena nirdiṣṭāḥ anye cāprameyākālamaraṇāḥ (Y,W)	e. xmāni sa(ṃ)kṣ(e)p(x)xxvāxxxxmaraṇāni tathāgatena nirdiṣṭāni anyāni cāprameyāxxxxlamaraṇāni (X)
[21]a. atha tatra parṣadi dvādaśa mahāyakṣasenāpatayaḥ sannipatitā abhūvan: kiṃbhīro mahāyakṣasenāpatir, vajro mahāyakṣasenāpatir, etc. (Y)	a. atha khalu tatra parṣāyāṃ dvā(daśa-mahā)yakṣasenāpataya·sannipatitā abhūvan yaduta kiṃbhīro nāma mahāyakṣasenāpati vajraś ca nāma mahāyakṣasenāpati, etc. (X, and probably W).
b. ekavācenaiva bhagavantam evam āhuḥ (Y)	b. ekakaṇṭhena bhagavatam evam āhu (X)

In looking at these 'differences' we can immediately make a certain number of general observations. First, for a small text there are a surprisingly large number of differences. Second, apart from one or two ambiguous cases, none of these 'differences' can be explained as the result of scribal errors. This is not to say that scribal error does not occasionally produce differences in our Mss.; but generally the purely scribal nature of the difference is obvious. Obvious cases of this kind I have excluded from the above list since simple scribal errors or mechanical corruptions due to transmission cannot be used as indicators of legitimate redactional differences (although they are often important indicators for determining the relationship of one Ms. to another). Third, a considerable number of these differences fall into more or less clearly delimitable categories. These categories are of interest and we will look at them in more detail:

Recasting into standardized sūtra phraseology: This is perhaps one of the most interesting categories, and its occurrence goes in a uniform direction. It is always redaction A which exhibits the reading in non--standardized phraseology, and always Redaction B which shows the 'recast' and standardized version. I have noted the following examples: [1]a. (esp. the yena ... tena ... construction), [1]b (which also falls into another category 'variation in lists'), [2]a (although the reading of A is found elsewhere, B represents the more common expression), [5.1]a, [7]b (the change in B to smaraṇa-), [13]a (cf. [16]13), [13]b and [13]g (the addition of -ratna in B), [13]c, [14]a, [16]k (nedaṃ, etc.), [17]a, [18]a, [18]b (upavāsam, etc.), [20]a, [21]a (yaduta ... nāma, etc.), [21]b (-kaṇṭhena in B). It should be noted that occasionally the 'recasting' amounts to no more than changing a single word (or the form of a word). Such cases then also fall into the category 'Substitution of a word'.

Making explicit in one redaction what is implicit in the other: This again is a very interesting category and here too its occurrence goes in a uniform direction. It is always Redaction B which makes explicit what is only implied in Redaction A. In two cases in A where the referrent of a pronoun is potentially ambiguous, B makes that referrent explicit: [17]c, where A's ye in B appears as te mitrajñātisālohitāsās; and [17]b where A's tena appears in B as tena puruṣena. Other cases, not involving pronouns are: [5.11]b (B's tanidānaṃ), [5.12]b (B's upadrutā), [11]b (B's upapatsyate), [15]a (B's sacet te), [18]e (B's veditavyaṃ, etc.), [19]b

(B's satvā), [20]c (B's xxnidānam, etc.), and [20]d (B's vāsāṃ, etc.).

Use of √ bhū: Redaction A exhibits a distinct tendency to use √ bhū very sparingly, connecting a whole string of predicate adjectives with a single √ bhū, where redaction B uses four [7]b, [11]c) or alters the construction considerably ([15]a). In two cases A does without a √ bhū where B has inserted one ([8]a, [17]b; in the latter it is not √ bhū, but syā[t]). [13]g exhibits a similar pattern with the verb √ dhṛ: where A uses only one, B shows two.

Substitution of one verb for another: This is perhaps the largest single category, there being as many as twenty-four examples. They can be broken down into a number of sub-categories. 1) *differences in prefixes attached to the same root:* [7]b, [14]d, [16]d; 2) *significant differences in form:* [14]d (A: kurvanti, B: kartavāṃ = kṛtavān). [19]b; [19]e (A: sampatsyati, B: -sampadā (bhavi)ṣyati; 3) *differences in entire verbal phrases:* [5.12]b, [12], [15]b (A: sīghraṃ parimucyati; B: sa sukhaṃ ca prasvayate), [16]f, [16]j, [16]l, [18]b, [20]d; 4) *simple substitution of one verb for another;* This is the largest sub-category: [5.12]b (A: upanāmayeyaṃ, B: upasaṃhareyaṃ), [8]c, [13]a, [13]f, [14]c, [14]d (A: pratilabhante, B: prāpnoti, [14]d (A: na paśyanti, B: praśamiṣyati), [15]c, [16]e, [18]d (A: pradīpitavyāḥ, B: prajvālayitavyā), [18]d: sthāpayitavyāḥ, B: prajvālayitavyā). It is impossible to detect a pattern here in terms of the relationship between A and B.

Transposition of the verb to the end of the phrase: Redaction B shows an unwillingness to have the main verb of a phrase or sentence anywhere but at the end; Redaction A shows no such unwillingness. Several of the cases which are to be classified here involve a formula repeated throughout the text. In A this formula always appears as: yai śrutaṃ bhaviṣyati tasya bhagavato bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya nāmadheyaṃ, while in B it always appears something like: yais tasya bhagavato bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya nāmadheyaṃ śrutaṃ bhaviṣyati, so [8]b, [9]a, [10]a, [11]a, [12]. Other examples of the same phenomenon, not connected with this formula, are to be found at [5.10]b, [13]g, and probably at [19]c.

Variation in the number of items in a list: This category can be further sub-divided into 1) *lists in compound where there are fewer items in A than in B:* [1]b, [5.10]b, [5.11]a, [9]b, [13]f; 2) *lists in compounds where there are fewer items in B than in A:* [7]b, [13]d, [16]k;

3) *lists not in compound where there are fewer items in A than in B:* [8]a, [14]b, [15]b (series of adjs.) [17]e (epithets). There is also one case where in a list not in compound there are more items in A than in B, [19]a; and one passage where in lists both in and out of compound there are more items in B than in A, [14]d. The only observation that can be made here is that there is a tendency, although not unduly strong, for B to show lists with more items than the corresponding lists in A.

We might also add here two cases where there is a difference in the order or sequence of the same items in a list: [7]b, [13]d.

Compounding: 1) *what is in compound in A is out of compound in B:* [4]a, [15]a, [16]g; 2) *what is in compound in B is out of compound in A:* [7]b, [8]c, [14]d, [19]a. One passage, [14]d, shows both phenomena; A: sarvaduḥsvapnadurnimittaṃ cāmaṃgalabhāvā, B: sarvadu[ḥ]svapnadurnimit[t]āmaṃṅgalyāś ca bhāvā; and there are two uncertain cases: [13]a, where the Mss. readings are uncertain; and [17]b, where B's sahajānuvaddhā may represent a case of double sandhi. In terms of the relationship between A and B, I am here not able to detect any definite pattern.

Substitution of one word for another: [5.10]a, [10]a, [12], [14]d, [15]a, [16]b, [16]h, [16]l, [17]b, [18]b, [18]b, [21]b. In virtually all these cases the word in B has a similar or related meaning to the corresponding word in A, and generally there does not appear to be any definite reason - apart from the individual taste of the redactors - to account for the difference. The three possible exceptions are [16]h, [18]b (A: upoṣadhasaṃvaraṃ, B: upavāsam) and [21]b, where the reading of B seems to represent a change to a more standardized piece of vocabulary.

Differences in word-order: [5.1]b, [13]g, [16]d, [17]c, [18]c, [19]c. These differences do not seem to exhibit any particular patterns; at most they can only indicate a slight change in emphasis.

Omissions in B of material in A: The three examples in this category must be viewed with some caution. It is not impossible that they might represent cases of simple scribal omission. The only point I can urge against this possibility is that in these Mss. simple scribal omissions - and there are a number of them - generally are not so neat. The omission is hardly ever of an entire self-contained phrase or sentence as in these three cases; it is, rather, almost always purely mechanical, resulting in

the loss of only parts or pieces of one or more complete sentences or phrases, as at [5.13]n.2, [6]n.11, [9]n.24, [14]n.33, [15]n.29, etc. With this caution, I would classify under the present category [5.5]a, [5.11]a and [17]b.

Of *omissions in A of material in B* I can find no firm examples which are not accounted for by other categories. For example, most, if not all, of the examples given under my second category could possibly - but I think wrongly - be described as examples of omissions in A of material in B. There are other instances of the same kind.

Variation in the form of numerals: This is a small category of only three definite examples: [17]d, [18]d, [18]e.

Apart from the one category of doctrinally significant variants which will be dealt with below, the above constitute the major categories or patterns of variation which I am able to discern. However, there are a significant number of examples which do not seem to fit into any pattern; the reading in A simply differs from the reading of B. Examples of this kind are [3]a, [4]c,d, [5.5]b, [5.9]a, [5.12]a, [9]b (although B here appears to be corrupt), [20]b. We should probably also add here [5.4]a and [14]d, where the material in A appears to have been condensed in B. This is an important group. Taken as a whole, the presence of examples of this kind seems to establish the principle that in prose we can expect a significant number of redactional differences which do not follow any pattern and which do not have any obvious explanation.

The final group of variants to be discussed is also the only group which appears to have a definite doctrinal significance. The variation here involves the presence or absence in a given passage of reference to hearing or preserving the name of the Buddha Bhaiṣajyaguru. If we look at the wording of the twelve vows, the first thing we notice is that our data is unfortunately incomplete: In the first four vows there is no reference to the nāmadheya in any of the Mss. The first reference we encounter is in [5.5]4; here both X and Z (= B) have the same basic reading in terms of the name: mā ca kasyaci śīlavipannasya mama nāmadheyaṃ śrutvā (mā kaci, X only) durgatigamanaṃ syāt, with which T only partially corresponds: ...bdag gi miṅ thos nas / bdag gi mthus ... However, it is important to note that Y, the basis for Redaction A, is here lost. For the 6th, 7th and 8th vow only B is preserved so we have no basis for

comparison except T. For the 6th and 7th T, like B, has reference to the name; but for the 8th, while B has reference to the name, T does not. In none of our sources for the 9th vow (A,B and T) is there mention of the name. For the 10th A has te madīyena puṇyānubhāvena parimucyeran sarvopadravebhyaḥ, and T bdag gi bsod nams kyi mthus gnod pa thams cad las yoṅs su thar bar gyur cig; but B has te mama nāmadheyaṃ śravaṇā madīyena puṇyānubhāvena, etc. For the 11th A has ahaṃ teṣāṃ varṇagandha-rasopetenāhārena śarīraṃ santarpayeyam, and T agrees with A; but B has sace te mama nāmadheyaṃ dhārayeyur ahaṃ teṣāṃ, etc. In the 12th vow we find exactly the same pattern, A and T not having reference to the name, but B having it. In terms of the vows alone, *for those cases where our data is complete,* we can note a distinct difference between Redaction A and Redaction B: in every case the latter incorporates a reference to hearing or preserving the name in its version of the vow where the former has none.

In those passages not directly connected with the vows the pattern, at least initially, is somewhat different. In [7], [8], [9], [10], [11], [12], and [13], in all our sources there is reference to hearing or preserving the name. At [15]a, however, this changes. Here A has ye tasya bhagavato bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya namasyanti pūjāṃ kurvanti, na teṣāṃ tryapāyaduḥkhaṃ pratikāṃkṣitavyaṃ; T: ... sman gyi bla bai ḍū rya'i 'od de la mchod pa rnam pa sna tshogs byed na ...; B, on the other hand has sacet te ... tasya bhagavato bhaiṣajyaguru-vaiḍūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya nāmadheyaṃ dhārayeyur ... Again at [15]b A has tathāgatasya namasyati pūjā ca kurvati, T has ... bai ḍū rya'i 'od de la mchod na, but B reads tathāgatasya nāmadheyam anusmare pūjā ca kuryu. The same pattern is also to be observed at [17]e where A has tasya tathāgatasya pūjā kartavyāḥ, which T follows exactly. But B has tasya bhagavato bhaiṣajyaguruxxryaprabhasya tathāgatasya nāmadheyaṃ dhārayetavyaṃ yathā saṃvidyamānā ca pūjāṃ kartavyā. There is one final example which exhibits a pattern not found elsewhere in that A and B agree, but T differs: A and B have: bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya namasyitavyaṃ, but T de bźin gśegs pa sman gyi bla bai ḍūrya'i 'od de'i mtshan yid la bya'o [18]7.

Any generalization concerning the relationship between Redactions A and B in reference to the presence or absence of references to hearing or preserving the name must be prefaced with the statement that hearing or preserving the name has an important place in both redactions. This is

amply demonstrated by sections [7] through [13]. In addition to this, however, it is clear that in Redaction B this importance receives considerably greater emphasis: the name, judging from the number of references to it, has become increasingly more significant. Incidentally it might be noted that this tendency is not without a certain comparative interest as regards the relationship between the Larger and Smaller Sukhāvatīvyūha-sūtras in reference to the relative importance that each attaches to hearing the name of Amitābha.

Stepping back from this mass of detail, we can make only a few general observations. We can say with certainty that there were *at least* two distinct redactions - which I have labelled A and B - of the Bhaiṣajyaguru-sutra circulating at Gilgit *at the same time*. When we compare these two redactions we observe that in relation to A, B shows a significant tendency to express itself in more standardized sūtra phraseology, to make explicit what is only implied or potentially ambiguous in A, to make increasing use of forms of √ bhū in constructing its sentences, to transpose the verb to the end of the phrase or sentence, and to emphasize more strongly the importance of hearing or preserving the name of Bhaiṣajyaguru. Now under different circumstances all these 'tendencies' would argue for the chronological priority of A. If, for example, A was a Gilgit Ms. and B a 13th century Nepalese Ms, such an argument would be obvious. But our situation is different: on the basis of place of origin and script, there is absolutely nothing to indicate that the Mss. of A and the Mss. of B were anything but contemporaneous. This, of course, does not necessarily say anything about the relative chronology of the two *redactions* which these contemporaneous Mss. contain, but it does indicate the need for some caution. If we are to take B as a later, revised redaction of A - and this is what the 'tendencies' mentioned above would indicate - what we would want is some evidence of a direct dependence of B on A. Here, fortunately, there is one piece of evidence which might establish such a dependence. [20] in A - and here A = Y and B = X, these being the only Mss. which preserve the passage - begins by saying atha tatra parṣadi dvādaśa mahāyakṣasenāpatayaḥ sannipatitā abhūvan, and then the individual yakṣa-generals are listed by name. But A, in spite of the 'twelve' of its first sentence, gives only eleven names. The corresponding passage in B is exasperatingly fragmentary. Still, and here I quote from my note on the passage [20]n.14, "Although two names are obliterated in X, it is clear that it had contained only eleven names; the number of akṣaras

exactly corresponds (allowing, that is, for the uniform insertion of nāma in X) to the number of akṣaras in Y (cf. notes 8 and 13); and in spite of some variation in spelling X appears to have given the names in the same order". In spite of the fact that the fragmentary nature of X precludes absolute certainty, this passage *seems to be* a clear case of the direct dependence of X on Y. It is virtually impossible to assume that exactly the same highly visible omission could have taken place in exactly the same way in both X and Y independently. It is extremely unlikely, given the 'tendencies' of B noted above, that A was in any way dependent on B. If this evidence is accepted as proof that X is directly dependent on Y, then in light of this dependence, and in light of the clear 'tendencies' of B vis-à-vis A, it seems altogether reasonable to describe B as representing a conscious, primarily stylistic, revision or updating of the text as preserved in A. But the situation found in [20] has one additional important implication. If it shows that the redactor of B based himself on A, it also shows that he did not have access to any other Ms. tradition or single Ms. which would have allowed him to correct this immediately obvious omission. The importance of this observation becomes obvious when we look at Z.

In considering Ms. Z it is necessary to note again that there is nothing to indicate that it is not roughly contemporaneous with Mss. X and Y. Given this, and given the fact that the redactor of X appears not to have had access to a Ms. or Ms. tradition on the basis of which he could have corrected the omission in [20], there appear to be at least two possibilities in reference to Z: either Z itself had the same reading as Y and was therefore both directly dependent on and slightly later than Y (again, it is virtually impossible to assume that the same omission occurred independently in both); or Z may be slightly later than X (and, therefore, also Y) and would not have been available to the redactor of X. In both possibilities Z appears to be slightly later than Y, so the real question concerns its position in reference to X. As I have indicated above, on the basis of the "corrections" made in it, Z appears to represent a conflated Ms. When we look at the actual readings of Z we find what might appear to be a similar pattern. In nine cases Z shows a reading which agrees with X against Y ([7]b, [11]b,c, [13]a,b,c,d,f, [19]b); in four cases Z has a reading which differs from both X and Y, but is closest to X ([7]a, [8]a, [14]a, [15]a); in thirty-one cases the reading of Z agrees with Y against X ([8]b,c, [9]a,b, [12], [13]g,h, [14]a,d, [15]b, [16]a,b,

c,d,e,f,g,h,i,j,k,l, [17]a,c,d,e, [19]a,c,d, [20]a,b,); and in four cases Z differs from X, but Y is missing ([5.4]a, [5.5]a,b, [15]c). Since Z shares readings with both Y and X here again there are at least two possibilites: 1) either Z represents an initial revision of Y which was then even further revised to produce X; or 2) Z represents a version which resulted from attempting to combine the version of Y with the version of X. The two possibilities might be represented in the following way:

either: Y - earliest version at Gilgit
↓
Z - initial revision
↓
X - further revision

or Y earliest version ↘
Z combined version
X revised version ↗

It is very difficult to choose between these two possibilities. As we have seen above the "corrected" version of Z could not have been arrived at on the basis of either X or Y alone; it presupposes either a comparison of X and Y, or a text, now no longer extant, which already had readings which sometimes agree with X and sometimes with Y. That is to say, on the basis of the "corrections", Z appears to presuppose the existence of a version of the text now represented by X. But I think it is easy to make too much of this. It is perfectly reasonable to suppose that the corrections to Z were added, if we accept the first possibility, after the "further revision" which produced X was already completed. This would only require that the earlier versions (Y and Z) continued to be read after the further revision into X was accomplished. It should also be borne in mind that these "corrections" in Z concern only a very small part of the entire text, and that when we consider the text as a whole, it is obvious that Z is much closer to Y than to X. This, of course, is difficult to explain if Z is the final form of the text at Gilgit. It would mean that someone intentionally restored several instances of non-standardized phraseology, irregular syntax, etc. This is contrary to anything we would expect in a final revision or updating, and argues more or less strongly for the priority of Z to X. This in turn suggests that the first of the two possibilities noted above is the most likely, that we have in our three main Mss. three different stages of the stylistic development of the text: Y represents the earliest form of the text at Gilgit; Z, an initial revision of the text; and X, a further revision

and, as far as we can tell, the final form of the text at Gilgit. It is important to note that this scheme is presented only as "the most likely possibility". The material available does not allow for any stronger statement. It should also be noted that the scheme presented here applies to *the development of the text at Gilgit only,* and not to any complete history of the text as a whole; such a history would have to take into account the evidence of both the Chinese and Tibetan translations. But even with this restriction, and even allowing for the fact that the evolution of the text as we see it is possibly a purely local development restricted to Gilgit, still the situation is not without some interesting implications. It clearly presents us with an instance where a single text circulated at the same place and roughly at the same time in three stylistically distinct redactions. It is here important to emphasize again that Y, Z and X cannot be separated from one another by anything but a relatively small space of time, and that they were all available to the Gilgit community at least just prior to the time when the stūpa in which they were discovered was sealed. This single, fairly well established instance should serve as a warning that a text may change considerably in style and even in doctrinal emphasis within a very short time, that two or more redactions of a single text may have been circulating at virtually the same time in the same place. It will, in any case, make it necessary to use even greater care in framing chronological arguments on the basis of what might appear to be far reaching redactional differences, or in emending a text on the basis of some hypothetical, *single,* "original" reading.

Before concluding this section I must say a few words about V and W, and about the quotations from our text in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya.* V consists of a single leaf and therefore any statement in reference to its relation to one or the other of our redactions can be only tentative. It is involved in thirteen of the variants we have set out above in two columns ([10]a to [13]g). In eleven of these its readings agree with X against Y; in one ([12]) it has a reading which differs from both X and Y, but is closer to the former; and in one case it agrees with Y against X ([13]b). This final case is not of great significance; where Y and V have sūtraṃ, X has sūtraratnaṃ. On the basis of the single leaf available, then, it appears that V, like X, preserved a text belonging to our Redaction B. For W our classification can only be even more tentative: it consists of a single small fragment of a single leaf, and represents the last part

of [20] and the beginning of [21]. The only indication of redactional affiliation is that it, like X and unlike Y, inserts nāma after the names of the yakṣasenāpatis listed in [21]. In reference to *Śikṣ* the situation, though more complicated, is not any more certain. It contains the text for almost all of [11], the whole of [12], about half of [15], and about three quarters of [16]. Although these quotations represent a not insignificant portion of our text, the readings in *Śikṣ* do not correspond exactly to the readings in any one of our three main Mss. Because the text of *Śikṣ* sometimes shares its readings with Y, and sometimes with X, it is possible to take it, like Z, as representing a transitional state of the text; but although *like* Z, it is by no means identical with it. Two points come to mind in reference to the text as it is found in *Śikṣ*: the lack of agreement between it and any one of our three Mss. may lend some weight to the observation made above that the relationships we discovered among the Gilgit Mss. may in fact represent a purely local development; or, this lack of agreement may be attributable to the fact that Śāntideva may have been quoting from memory and did not actually have a text of *Bhg* before him. These possibilities, of course, are not mutually exclusive.

Finally, as a kind of footnote to all that has been said above, I must point out that my observations are entirely based on the written Ms. tradition of *Bhg* at Gilgit. I have not taken into account the possible role or influence of a possibly contemporaneous oral 'Ms.' tradition which may have been current there. This, of course, is because it is impossible to know anything definite concerning such an oral tradition, although I readily concede that the possibility of there having been such a tradition is very strong, and acknowledge the fact that it would undoubtedly have had a considerable impact on the written tradition. The only thing I can say here is that it seems to me that Y *might* represent the earliest attempt *at Gilgit* to reduce an oral tradition of the text to writing. About the relationship of the further literary 'revisions' or refinements to any oral tradition I can say nothing which would not be pure speculation. On the possible influence of oral on written traditions see the interesting paper recently published by Georg v. Simson, "Zur Phrase yena ... tenopajagāma / upetya und ihren Varianten im buddhistischen Sanskrit", *Beiträge zur Indienforschung* (Berlin: 1977) 479-88. In addition to this question, Simson's paper raises another question which is directly relevant to the Ms. traditions

of *Bhg*. This is the question of what does or does not constitute an actual variant of the kind of formula he is discussing. He cites a number of examples of his formula, yena ... tenopasaṃkkrāmī / upetya .., yena ... tenopasamakrāmat / upasaṃkramya ..., etc. Now I do not think anyone would hesitate to classify X's bhagavāṃ ... yaina vaiśālīṃ mahānagariṃ·tenānuprāpto bhūt at [1]a as a variant of this formula. But when we look at the corresponding reading in Y the situation is much more difficult. Y has bhagavāṃ ... vaiśālim anuprāpto. That this is a variant of the formula would, I think, be difficult to maintain. As a matter of fact, it is perhaps best characterized, vis-à-vis X, as a piece of 'preformulaic' prose. Such an instance highlights both the need for establishing some kind of definite limits for the acceptable range of formulaic variation, and the utility of formulaic considerations once such limits are established.

III. Notes On and Towards a Methodology.

It should be made clear from the very beginning that my intention was not to reconstruct the text of a hypothetically conceived 'original' version of *Bhg*, nor to assemble from the various Mss. a single text which was supposed to present the sum of the 'best' possible readings. This appeared to be both undesirable as well as methodologically impossible given the material before me. As a matter of fact, this material - five Mss. representing at least two, and probably three, redactions, *but* all of approximately the same date and all coming from exactly the same place - presents an essentially new situation to the text-critic and editor, a situation in which the conventional procedures of text-criticism usually applied to Sanskrit Buddhist texts either do not work or work only imperfectly.

The five Mss. of *Bhg* found at Gilgit differ among themselves to a greater or lesser degree in almost any given phrase, but - and this is an important 'but' - although they differ, given their virtual identity of date and actual identity of place of origin, we have at present no legitimate criteria which could be applied to justify the selection of one 'correct' reading in preference to another which, though different, is equally 'correct'. There is, in short, no way of declaring one reading *more* 'valid' or 'correct' than another. And we are here not talking about only one or two places in the text. For the *majority* of the redactional differences listed above we have no explanation (e.g. 'substitution of

one verb for another', 'substitution of one word for another', etc.). They simply differ. (Cf. the remarks of C. Regamey, "Motifs vichnouites et śivaïtes dans le Kāraṇḍavyūha", *Études tibétaines dédiées à la mémoire de Marcelle Lalou* (Paris: 1971) 418, where it is clear that in editing the *Kāraṇḍavyūha* he has encountered and is struggling with similar - if not exactly the same - problems.)

Confronted by this situation, the only methodologically sound procedure seemed to be to take one of the five Mss. as the basis of an edition, to *in effect edit this one Ms.*, and give the variants from the other Mss. only in the critical apparatus. After studying all the Mss., I chose Y as the one Ms. I would edit for two important reasons: 1) it was one of the two most complete Mss. (X being the other); and 2) it appeared to represent an unrevised, and therefore earlier written redaction of the text. By choosing to edit Y I arrived at what appeared to be the only legitimate criterion for the selection of readings: I chose in effect to prefer the readings of Y over any others. Even in those cases where one or more of the other Mss. had a reading which - assuming a hypothetical 'correct' text - appeared to give a 'better' text in terms of grammar, syntax, style or meaning, I have as a general principle preferred the reading of Y or a reasonable emendation based on that reading. There are very few and only minor exceptions to this. This procedure seemed to me to be the only effective means of bracketing any question of ultimate validity or correctness and of avoiding premature or subjective judgement.

For those portions of the text for which Y was missing - the most important being [5.2] to [5.6] - other procedures were obviously required. In such cases, if I had Z - as I did at [5.2] to [5.6] - and if Z differed from X, I have preferred Z over X. The procedure here is based on the observation that in the variants studied above in two out of every three cases Z agreed with Y against X. Now although I have admitted these readings of Z into the text of Redaction A, they cannot be accepted as legitimate readings of that redaction without reservation. It is possible, for example, that although Z differs from X, it might also have differed from Y (as at [7]a, [8]a, [14]a, and [15]a). Their admission into the text is, therefore, open to doubt. In those cases where I had X alone, its reading was of necessity adopted, *but always in brackets*. That is to say, that it is not meant to be taken as representing the text of Redaction A.

It is perhaps worth pointing out that in choosing to edit a single manuscript, and in taking that manuscript as representative of a separate redaction, I have in fact followed the general procedure adopted in what is to my knowledge the most recent attempt to distinguish redactional differences in the manuscript tradition of a Buddhist text. For this is, in regard to the general principle, exactly what A. Yuyama has done in his recently published *Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā (Sanskrit Recension A)* (Cambridge: 1976). Given the almost total lack of discussion in the literature regarding the characteristics and criteria by which redactional differences can or should be established, it is to be all the more regretted that Dr. Yuyama did not give us a detailed discussion of the method and principles by which he worked (cf. my review of this edition in *IIJ* 20 (1978) 110-24).

My choice of Y as the manuscript I would edit, and the consequent acceptance of it as the criterion for the selection of readings, had important further consequences. As will already be obvious from the table of redactional differences and my comments there, I now think that Y represents an 'unrevised' text, a kind of 'rough draft' (it might, in fact, represent a first attempt *at Gilgit* to commit an oral tradition to writing). By its very nature then, the text I have established as Redaction A lacks any number of the stylistic conventions and phraseological niceties common to Mahāyāna Sūtra prose. Judged by the standards of similar prose found in late Nepalese manuscripts (i.e., prose which has been subjected to hundreds of years of written conventions) it is syntactically very clumsy and grammatically peculiar. It is, in short, not what we are wont to think of as a 'correct' text. But on the assumption that I was right in thinking that Y represented an 'unrevised' text, then, since the preservation of such an 'unrevised' version is, in my experience, unique, I was very reluctant to make any but minor changes in the text. I only very reluctantly "corrected" faults in subject-verb agreement, in forms of verbs or verbal endings, in declensional endings, spelling, etc. The same is true of syntax. For example, there were a number of places where X read a pronoun, and where the inclusion of a pronoun would have given an easier, less clumsy reading for the phrase, but I intentionally excluded the pronoun from my text, admitting it only when its absence meant serious ambiguity or unintelligibility. In brief, my intention was to preserve as much as possible of the text's 'unrevised' character and still present a readable text - readable; not fluent, 'correct' or unproblematic.

My treatment of sandhi departs in some ways from the above. In comparing the sandhi found in Y with that found not only in the four other Mss. of *Bhg*, but also to that found in virtually all the Mss. from Gilgit, it seemed to me obvious that Y was, in terms of sandhi, in no way unique. It exhibits the same features, or absence of features, as are found throughout the collection. Since establishing definite criteria would have involved a minute and detailed study of the entire collection, and since neither time nor temperament would allow this, I adopted the following principle out of sheer editorial expedience: if any one Ms. had the correct 'classical' form, I adopted it. If none had the 'correct' form I generally preferred the form found in Y.

In my remarks above on redactional differences I have analyzed, more correctly, classified - however provisionally - the major peculiarities of syntax and style. I have not done the same for the grammatical peculiarities, and this for the following reason: *Bhg* is a very short text and as a consequence any generalizations which might be generated from an analysis of it alone could have little if any validity. Since the Gilgit texts allow for a definite periodization of the written tradition of Mahāyāna Sūtra prose (i.e., we can see there what this prose *actually* looked like in the 5th-6th century), what is needed is an analysis of the 'grammar' of the whole collection. Only then will we have definite criteria by which individual variations can be judged. Until then it is perhaps a dubious undertaking to analyze any one individual text in terms, say, of its variation from classical norms, or even those of BHSG (the latter being based to a large degree on verse and on editions - not actual manuscript usage - of late Nepalese material). With this in mind I have left a number of grammatical problems unresolved in my text. Some are treated in notes to the edition or translation, some are not. The latter are not treated because I had nothing intelligent to say about them and because I did not see the point in trying to explain or account for isolated instances of what might turn out to be - when the whole collection is studied - only examples of a common practice. In such cases my own interpretation - not explanation - can be seen in my translation.

I might here take a particular example to illustrate the above remarks. At [5.4.] my edition reads 'haṃ kum⌈ārgaprati⌉pannāḥ satvā bodhimārge pratiṣṭhāpayeyaṃ śrāvakamārgapratipann⌈āḥ pratyekabuddhamā⌉rgapratipannā vā sarve mahāyāne niyojya pratiṣṭhāpaye⌈yaṃ⌉. This is the reading of Z,

but śrāvakamārgapratipann[āḥ, etc.] is restored on the basis of the Tib. Obviously, however, the -āḥ is not restored on that basis. I have supplied it on the basis of the preceding -pannāḥ. I could have equally restored it as -ā on the basis of the following -pannā. Or I could have given it as -pannān, the 'correct' form. If I would have taken the last alternative I would have also had to 'correct' the entire passage as well, reading ..kum[ārgaprati]pann*ān* satv*ān* ... śrāvakamārgapratipann[*ān* pratyekabuddha-mā]rgapratipann*ān* ... That is to say that I would have had to *presuppose* that -āḥ and -ā were simply scribal errors for -ān (probably through -āṃ and the consequent easy omission of the anusvāra for -ā; and through a substitution of visarga for anusvāra for -āḥ; or even some 'rule' of Gilgit sandhi, e.g. [14] n.49, [19] n.27). This is one alternative. Another would have been to read -āḥ and -ā and to see in them instances of masc. acc. pl. endings in āḥ and in -ā. A third alternative would have been to read -āḥ and -ā, and in translating to take them implicitly as acc.s (context makes it clear that they cannot be anything else), while bracketing the question of whether they should be interpreted as scribal errors or as legitimate declensional endings. Now I am well aware that most people would have almost automatically opted for the first alternative (with the equally automatic assumption that the individuals who actually preserved these texts were a lot of linguistic bumpkins who had nothing like our present wisdom.) I could not take this alternative chiefly for two reasons: first I found it methodologically impossible to presuppose a 'correct' original text for *Bhg* (if anything the movement in the Mss. of *Bhg* at Gilgit is not from a 'correct' to an 'incorrect' text, but the reverse); secondly, because acc.s in -āḥ or -ā are found several times in *Bhg* ([5.9], [10], [14] n.49, etc.), and even a cursory examination of those Gilgit texts which have been carefully edited indicates that such endings are not infrequent (E. Conze, *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Aṣṭādaśasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā, Chapters 70 to 82* (Rome: 1974) 25.19, 21; 41.8, 14, 15; 46.12; Y. Kurumiya, *Ratnaketuparivarta, Sanskrit Text* (Kyoto: 1978) 173.12; etc. etc.). This is not to say that I think the first alternative is wrong (it very possibly is not). It did seem to me, however, that there were more than enough indications to make it clear that to *assume* it was right was itself wrong. The second alternative was also problematic. Its adoption would have required either that the 'results' of an analysis based on a single small text be accepted as legitimate; or that a grammatical investigation of the entire Gilgit collection be undertaken. Neither

of these - for different reasons - was acceptable. This left the third alternative and, although for those who want in an edition a 'correct' text with all of the problems accounted for this may not be very comforting, I have followed this alternative throughout, both in regard to these accusatives and in regard to a number of other 'grammatical' problems.

Behind much of my thinking on all these matters was an observation the true significance of which I cannot determine. The observation is this: as we have seen above X and especially Z have been "corrected" by someone, *but* these corrections never concern what appear to us as faults of grammar, sandhi, etc. As a matter of fact the "corrections" themselves sometimes contain such faults. What does this say about the way the individual who took the trouble to correct these Mss. saw what we see as errors of grammar, etc. ? This question is perhaps more important than has generally been recognized. The way it is eventually answered will have definite consequences for any theory of editorial procedure.

I must also note here another external factor which influenced my methodology because it, in large measure, accounts for the fact that I may not have been as consistent in my handling of the variants as some might have liked. This factor was the continuous and seemingly inexorable increase in the size of the critical apparatus. I had to constantly attempt to keep it within reasonable bounds. In terms of my handling of the variants from the Mss. this meant basically two things. First that I would attempt to economize on the number of notes by treating, wherever possible, phrases rather than individual words. That is to say rather than, e.g. aneke[27] ca te[28] satvā[29] ye[30], I would prefer: 27)aneke ca te satvā ye(27. Second, that I would occasionally ignore trivial variations in spelling in Mss. other than Y.

This same consideration has influenced my handling of the Tibetan in the critical apparatus. But here there was the additional factor that a complete critical edition of the Tibetan text immediately follows the Sanskrit text. This, it seemed to me, justified a restricted use of the Tibetan and, as a consequence, my use of it was intended to be *illustrative, not definitive*. It is generally cited when it differs significantly from Y. It is also cited when it confirms Y, when Y is 'misspelled' or partly illegible (it then often serves as the basis of my correction), or when Y appears unduly peculiar. It is also cited a number of times when it

differs from all the Mss. and thus appears to represent a separate tradition. I have also attempted to illustrate by selective citation that in addition to sometimes representing a separate tradition, it sometimes agrees with one redaction and sometimes another. When Redaction B is edited, then a detailed study of the relationship of the Tibetan translation vis-à-vis the two redactions will be possible. Until then any general statement on this relationship - obviously a complicated one - would be premature.

The need to keep the critical apparatus within reasonable bounds also lead me to exclude virtually any reference to the previous edition of *Bhg* done by N. Dutt. This edition is essentially an edition of X and is very carelessly done. It should be clear from the small sample piece of this edition I discussed in *IIJ* 19 (1977) 208-10, that if I had taken it into account in my notes the critical apparatus would have been twice as large as it already is.

I must also say a few words about the punctuation and the paragraphing found in the edition. There are two problems with the punctuation in the original Ms. It is too sparse and occasionally too erratic to be of use for the purpose of dividing the text into meaningful or manageable parts. It also depends in many cases on conventions which are imperfectly understood or ambiguous. For example, it has already been recognized that : sometimes stands for ḥ and sometimes appears to be used as a mark of punctuation. The same thing, I think, applies to ⌒ or ◞ . This is the most common punctuation mark in the Gilgit Mss. as a whole, but it also seems to be used sometimes for visarga. With these problems in mind I decided that I would insert into the text my own punctuation (i.e. commas, colons, semi-colons, etc.). Since, however, all imposed punctuation is unavoidably interpretative I have used as little as possible. Where it was possible I have dispensed with it altogether. Where this was not possible I have simply tried to break the text up into manageable pieces, or I have punctuated it in accordance with my understanding of the sense. But in line with my intention to preserve as much as possible of the character of my Ms., I have also marked in my edition the actual punctuation found in Ms. Y (I have ignored all the other Mss.; the five taken together very often do not punctuate in the same way). This has been done by means of two symbols: ∝ = ⌒ or ◞ , and ∞ = ⌒)) . These symbols are inserted beneath the line of my edition at the point at which the original

punctuation mark occurs in the Ms. ◠ or ◡ as I have already noted is the most common mark of punctuation at Gilgit and is used anywhere. ◠)) on the other hand appears to have been used chiefly - though not exclusively - to mark the end of a section or 'paragraph', and I have taken this apparent usage into account in the paragraphing I have imposed on the text. Thi- can be seen in the fact that although the divison into paragraphs in my edition is my own, in most cases the end of my paragraph corresponds to a point in the Ms. at which a ◠)) occurs.

Finally let me conclude this section by stating what is implied in its title - "Notes On and Towards a Methodology" - as well as in much of what I have said. Given the uniqueness of the Ms. material before me - five Mss. containing at least two, and probably three separate redactions, *but* all of the same date and all coming from the same place - and given the uniqueness of Y as apparently representing a case where an 'unrevised' version of a text has been preserved, I found myself in unmapped territory, territory in which the usual conventions of text-criticism were very often times of little help. In light of this my general method, my edition and the redactional suppositions which underlie it must be considered in at least some sense experimental. As such they raise more problems than they solve.

The

Sanskrit Text

[0] oṃ namaḥ sarvajñāya. namo bhagavate bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūrya-prabharājāye tathāgatāye[1].

1) X: xxxxv(x)t(x)bh(x)ṣajyaguruxxxxxxx tathāgat(x)x: T: saṅs rgyas daṅ / byaṅ chub sems dpa' thams cad la phyag 'tshal lo.

[1] evaṃ mayā śrutam ekasmin samaye: bhagavāṃ janapadacaryāṃ caramāṇo [1)] vaiśālīm anuprāpto; vaiśālyāṃ viharati sma[(1]. vādyasvare vṛkṣamūle[2] mahatā bhikṣusaṃghena sārdham, aṣṭābhir bhikṣusahasraiḥ ṣaṭtriṃśatibhiś[3] ca bodhisatvasahasraiḥ sārdham, rājāmātyabrāhmaṇa-gṛhapatibhiḥ[4] devāsuragaruḍakinnaramahoragaiḥ[5] parivṛtaḥ puraskṛto[6] dharman deśayati sma.

1)(1 X: nupūrveṇa yaina vaiśālīṃ mahānagariṃ •· tenānuprāpto bhūt tatra khalu bhagavānn vaiśālyāṃ viharati sma; T: ... rgyu źiṅ yaṅs pa can du byon te / yaṅs pa can na .... 2) T: rol mo'i sgra can gyi śiṅ ljon pa'i druṅ na. 3) X: ṣaṣriṃśatiś or ṣaṣṭiṃ-. 4) X:-patirbhir mahatyā ca -. 5) X: devanāga . yakṣaṅgandharvāsuragaruḍakiṃnnaḥramahoraga · manuṣyāmanuṣyaparṣadā. 6) X:-kṛton.

[2] atha khalu maṃjuśrīr dharmarājaputro buddhānubhāvenotthāyāsanād[1], ekāṃsaṃ cīvaraṃ prāvṛtya[2], dakṣiṇaṃ jānumaṇḍalaṃ[3] pṛthīvyāṃ[4] pratiṣṭhāpya, yena bhagavāṃs tenāṃjaliṃ[5] praṇamya[6], bhagavantam etad avocat: deśayatu bhagavāṃs teṣāṃ tathāgatānāṃ nāmadheyāni pūrvapraṇidhānaviśeṣavistaraṃ[7] ca yaṃ śrutvā satvāḥ[8] sarvakarmāvaraṇaṃ[9] viśodhayeyuḥ, teṣāṃ paścime kāle paścime samaye saddharmapratirūpake vartamāne satvānāṃ[10] anugraham upādāya[11].

1) X: -ennosthāyāṃsannād. 2) X: ekāṃ[samuttarā]saghaṃ kṛtvā. 3) X: jānnu-. 4) X: pṛthivyācca ? 5) X: tenāṃjjaliṃ. 6) X: praṇamyar. 7) X: -viśaiṣa · vistaravibhaṅgaṃ. 8) X: has sarvasatvā; Y omits sarvasatvā, but has a 3rd pl. for the verb of the clause, which requires something like sarvasatvā for its subject; T (see next note) though constructed differently has also read a satva. 9) X:_āvaraṇāni; T: sems can rnams kyi las kyi sgrib pa =

satvānām karmāvaraṇaṃ. 10) X: sátvām; T: sems can de dag (rjes su gzuṅ ba'i slad du). For the whole of this speech by Mañjuśrī cf. the different word order in T. 11) The phrase paścime kāle, etc. sandwiched between teṣāṃ and satvānām looks like a later insertion of a well known cliché.

[3] atha bhagavāṃ maṃjuśrīye kumārabhūtāya sādhukāraṃ adāt: sādhu sādhu maṃjuśrīḥ[1] kāruṇikas[2], tvaṃ maṃjuśrīḥ[1] aprameyaṃ kāruṇyaṃ[3] janayitvā mamādhyeṣasi[4] nānākarmāvaraṇāvṛtānāṃ satvānām arthāya hitāya sukhāya devamanuṣyāṇāṃ[5]. tena hi maṃjuśrīḥ śṛṇu sādhu ca suṣṭhu ca manasikuru bhāṣiṣye[6][α]. evaṃ bhagavann iti maṃjuśrīḥ kumārabhūto bhagavataḥ pratyaśrauṣīt

1) X: maṃjuśrī. 2) X: mahākāruṇikas; T: omits both mahā-, and also kāruṇikas. 3) X: kāruṇaṃ. 4) X: -ādhyeṣase; T: gsol ba 'debs pa; mama is not formally expressed. 5) X: inserts here ca hitārthāya; T has structured the whole clause in a slightly different way: sems can las kyi sgrib pa sna tshogs kyis bsgribs pa rnams daṅ / lha daṅ / mi rnams kyi don daṅ / phan pa daṅ / bde ba'i phyir .... 6) Y: bhāṣiṣyāmahe.

[4] bhagavān asyaitad[1] avocat: asti maṃjuśrīḥ purastime[2] digbhāge ito buddhakṣetrāt[3] daśagaṃgānadīvālukāsamān[4] buddhakṣetrān[5] atikramya vaiḍūryanirbhāsā[6] nāma lokadhātus. tatra bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabho nāmo tathāgato 'rhan[7] samyaksaṃbuddho[8] viharati, vidyācaraṇasaṃpannaḥ sugato lokavid anuttaraḥ puruṣadamyasārathiḥ śāstā devamanuṣyāṇāṃ[9] buddho bhagavān. tasya[10] maṃjuśrīr bhagavato bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya pūrve[11] bodhisatvacārikāṃ carata[12][α] imāni dvādaśamahāpraṇidhānāny abhūvan[13]. katamāni dvādaśāni[14]?

1) X: (bhagavāṃ)n asyetad; Y: (bhagavān) asyatad; T: de la 'di skad ces. 2) X: p(x)rx(x)smi; T: śar phyogs. 3) X: -kṣetrā. 4) X: -vāluk(x)xxni; Y: -pālukā-. 5) X: -kṣetrāṇy. 6) X: -nibhāsā. 7) X: tagatorha; Y: (')rhān. 8) X: -buddha. 9) X: devānāṃ ca · manuṣyāṇāṃ ca. 10) X: inserts here khalu puna. 11) X: pūrvaṃ. 12) X: carataḥ-; Y: caratā. 13) X: avabhūvaṃ-. 14) X: dvādaśamahāpraṇidhānāni; Y: dvādaśaḥ.

[5.1] prathamaṃ[1] tasya mahāpraṇidhānam abhūt: yadāhaṃ[2] anāgate 'dhvani buddhabodhim[3] abhisaṃbudhyeyaṃ [4)]tadāprameyāsaṃkhyeyāparimāṇā lokadhātavo mama śarīrābhayā[(4] bhrājeraṃs taperaṃ[5] viroceraṃ[6]. [7]dvātriṃśadbhiḥ mahāpuruṣalakṣaṇai[8] [[9]samanvāgato aśītibhiś cānuvyaṃjanair alaṃkṛtadehas tathaiva sarvasatvā[...]][10].

1)X: prathame. 2)X: dyaham. 3)X: ('dhvany)inu[tt̶ar]āyāṃ samyaksaṃbodhim; T: bla na med pa yaṅ dag par rdzogs pa'i byaṅ chub. 4)(4X: tadā mama śarīr(x)xxxxprameyā - saṃkhyeyāparimāṇā lokadhātavo; T: de'i tshe bdag gi lus kyi 'od kyis 'jig rten gyi khams graṅs med dpag tu med ciṅ dpag gis mi laṅ ba lag. 5)X: taped. 6)X: virocera, or perhaps, -ceta. 7)X: yathā cāhaṃ (dvātṛṃśad-). 8)Fol. 13b of Ms. Y ends here, and fol. 14 is lost, leaving a gap of 12 lines of about 60 akṣaras each. 9)We give here in brackets the text of Ms. X. The brackets are necessary in that Ms. X represents a separate redaction and therefore cannot be taken directly into the texts. In addition, Ms. X at just this point is distinctly faulty. Dutt says that "one leaf is here missing", but the pagination is continuous and it appears rather that the scribe inadvertently omitted a piece of text equal in size to almost one entire leaf. 10)We have inserted bracketed ellipsis to mark the omission, although in the Ms. the text is continuous: satvāxmaṃ, etc. The last sentence of 5.1 in T reads: sems can thams cad skyes bu chen po'i mtshan sum cu rtsa gñis daṅ dpe byad bzaṅ po brgyad cus legs par brgyan par gyur te / bdag ci 'dra ba de bźin du sems can thams cad kyaṅ de 'dra bar gyur cig ces btab bo.

[5.2][1] [...]xmaṃ diśaxxx nānādiśāṃ gac[2]cheran kāni ca karmāṇi kuxxx[3]].

1)Of the text for the 2nd vow this fragment is all we have; it forms the last part of the last sentence; after kuxxx immediately follows [tṛtī]yaṃ tasya mahāpraṇidhāna.... 2)Ms. Z fol. 4a starts here. 3)Z: -cchantu karmāṇi ca kurvantu. In T the 2nd vow reads: de'i smon lam chen po gñis pa ni / gaṅ gi tshe bdag ma 'oṅs pa'i dus na bla na med pa yaṅ dag par rdzogs pa'i byaṅ chub mṅon par rdzogs par saṅs rgyas pa de'i tshe bdag byaṅ chub thob pa na lus nor bu rin po che bai ḍū rya ci 'dra bar de 'dra bar phyi naṅ śin tu yoṅs su dag pa daṅ / dri ma med la 'od gsal ba daṅ / kho lag yaṅs śiṅ che ba daṅ / dpal daṅ / gzi brjid 'bar ba daṅ / legs par gnas pa daṅ / ñi ma daṅ / zla ba bas lhag pa'i 'od zer gyi dra ba rnams kyis legs par brgyan par gyur cig / de na sems can gaṅ dag 'jig rten gyi

bar dag tu skyes ba dag dań gań dag yań mi'i 'jig rten 'di na mtshan mo mun pa mun nag gi nań na phyogs tha dad par 'gro ba de dag bdag gi 'od kyis phyogs dga' mgur 'gro bar gyur cig / las rnams kyań byed par gyur cig ces btab bo /

[5.3] tṛtīyan tasya mahāpraṇidhānam abhūt: b[o]dhiprā[ptasya ca][1] me[2] aprameyaprajñopāyabalādhānena[3] [4)]-aparimāṇāḥ satvadhātavaḥ a[kṣaya-upa]bhogaparibhogā bhaveyuḥ[(4], mā ca[5] kasyacid[6] satvasya kenaci[7] vaik[alyam][8] syāt.

1) Reconstructed from X; akṣaras lost in Z. T: gań gi tshe bdag ma 'ońs pa'i dus na bla na med pa yań dag par rdzogs pa'i byań chub mńon par rdzogs par sańs rgyas pa de'i tshe bdag byań chub thob pa na ... This is formulaic in T, all the vows beginning in the same way (it will not be noted in future notes), and constitutes one of a small number of significant places where T agrees with none of our Mss. 2) X: here inserts ye. 3) So X; Z: ādhānanā; T: see next note. 4)(4 X: -āparimānasya sanadhātaur [= -dhātor?] akṣayā upabhogayā paribhogayā syūr; Z: -āparimāṇām satvadhātuṃ a[kṣaya-upa]-bhogaparibhogā bhaveyu; T: (for the whole passage starting after ca me): bdag gi śes rab dań thabs dpag tu med pas [omitting -balādhānenā-] sems can gyi khams dpag gis mi lań ba dag lońs spyod [representing either upabhoga or paribhoga, but omitting one] mi zad pa dań ldan par gyur te /. Our reading is a conjucture based on T which clearly indicates that the subject of the sentence is -āparimāṇāḥ satvadhātavaḥ, and that it is plural. Noting the occasional interchange of -ṃ for -ḥ in our Mss., our emendation of -āparimāṇāḥ is hardly drastic; -dhātuṃ must simply be a scribal oversight. 5) X: omits mā ca. 6) X: kasyaci. 7) X: keṇacid. 8) So X; T: brel ba med par.

[5.4] caturtham tasya mahāpraṇidhānam[1] abhūt[2]: bodhiprāpto 'haṃ [3)]kum[ārgaprati]pannāḥ satvā bodhimārge pratiṣṭhāpayeyam, śrāvakamārga-pratipann[āḥ pratyekabuddhamā][4]rgapratipannā vā sarve mahāyāne niyojya pratiṣṭhāpaye[yam][5(3]

1) Z: -dhānamm. 2) Z: abhūva. 3)(3 X: ye kumārgapratipannānāṃ satvānāṃ · śrāvakaxxkabuddhapratipannāś ca te satvā anutare bodhimārge mahāyāne niyojayeyaṃ. T follows Z except in the construction of the verb in the

2nd clause where it has gzud par bya'o only. For acc. pl. in -āḥ see Introduction. 4)Restored on the basis of T. 5)Restored on the basis of preceding pratiṣṭhāpayeyaṃ.

[5.5] [paṃcamaṃ tasya][1] mahāpraṇidhānam[2] abhūt[3]: bodhiprāptasya[4] me ye kecit[5] satvā ma[ma śāsane brahma][6] - caryaṃ caranti[7], 8)tathā cānye aprameyāsaṃkhyeyāparimāṇā satvās, te sa[r]v[e](8 akhaṇḍaśīlā syuḥ[9] trisaṃvarasaṃvṛtā[10]; mā ca kasyaci śīlavipannasya[11] mama nāmadheyaṃ śrutvā[12] durgatigamanaṃ syāt[13].

1)So X; but the space in Ms. Z would seem to require either 6 or 7 akṣaras. 2)Z: -dhānaṃṃ. 3)Z: abhūva. 4)X inserts ca. 5)X: has a second ye instead of kecit. 6)So Ms. X. 7)X: careyu. 8)(8X: has only te sarve. T differs from Z only in omitting one of the three adjectives (sems can gźan) dpag tu med ciṅ dpag gis mi laṅ ba. 9)X: syūs; Z: bhavanti. 10)X: tṛsaṃvṛtā; Z: tṛsaṃvara-. 11)So Ms. X; Z has what looks like vīrcch(x)la-, part of the 2nd akṣara is obliterated; T: tshul khrims log par źugs te / 12)In T nāmadheyaṃ śrutvā is placed after sa[r]v[e] and is followed by bdag gi mthus which has no counterpart in any of the Skt Mss. X inserts mā kaci after śrutvā. 13)Z: bhavati.

[5.6] ṣaṣṭhaṃ[1] tas[y]a mahāpraṇidhānaṃ abhūt[2]: bodhiprāptasya[3] me ye kecit[4] satvā hī[nakā]yā vikalendriyā durvarṇā[5] 6)jaḍā khelā kā(ṇā) laṃgā kubjā(6 7[śvitrā[8] kāṇḍā[9] andhā badhirā[10] unmat[t]ā[11] cānye śarīrajā-vyādhayas[12], te mama nāmadheyaṃ śrutvā sarve sakalendriyā suparipūrṇagātrā bhaveyuḥ.

1)X: ṣaṣṭṭaṃ; Z: ṣaṣṭha. 2)X: abhū; Z: vabhūvaḥ. 3)X: inserts ca. 4)X: omits kecit. 5)X: -varnā. 6)(6X: jaḍaitākā - laṃkā; Z: after kubjā adds: [x]xā kā; then there are several folios of Z missing. T: bems po [instead of jaḍā khelā kāṇā] daṅ / yan lag skyon can [= laṃgā] daṅ / sgur po [= kubjā] daṅ /. 7)From this point for several lines of text we have only Ms. X which we here give in brackets. 8)T: śa bkra. 9)T: źar ba; according to Jä 472[2] źar ba = yan lag ma tshan: "being not in full possession of one's members". 10)X:

vadhirā. 11)T: smyon pa. 12)T: lus la nad kyis btab pa

[5.7] saptamam tasya mahāpranidhānam abhūt: bodhiprāptasya ca me ye[1] nānāvyādhiparipīditā satvā atrānā aśaranā bhaisajyopakarana-virahitā anāthā daridrā duhkhitā, sace tesām mama nāmadheyam karna-pute nipatet[2], tesām sarvavyādhaya praśameyuh nirogāś ca nirupadravāś ca syūr[3] yāva bodhiparyavasānam[4]

1)T: sems can gaṅ su dag. 2)X: nipatey[uh]; T: does not treat this as a conditional clause: sdug bsṅal ba gaṅ dag gi rna lam du bdag gi miṅ grag pa. grag pa = nadati, not nipat-. 3)X: syūd. 4)In T this final clause is constructed in a slightly different way: byaṅ chub kyi mthar thug gi bar du nad med ciṅ gnod pa med par gnas par gyur cig /.

[5.8] astamam tasya mahāpranidhānam abhūt[1]: ya kaści mātrgrāmo nānāstrīdosaśatai samklistam strībhāvam vijugupsan[2], mātrgrāmayonim[3] parimoktukāmo[4], mama nāmadheyam dhāraye[t], tasya mātrgrāmasya na strībhāvam bhaved yāva bodhiparyavasānam[5].

1)T gives here the full form of the standard formula (see n.5). 2)X: vi-jugupsamnta; T: bud med kyi dṅos po la smod pa /. 3)X: -yoni; T: skye gnas las. 4)X: parimukta; I have followed T; see next. 5)T preserves this vow in a different form: de'i smon lam chen po brgyad pa ni gaṅ gi tshe bdag ma 'oṅs pa'i dus na / bla na med pa yaṅ dag par rdzogs pa'i byaṅ chub mṅon par rdzogs par saṅs rgyas pa de'i tshe bdag byaṅ chub thob pa na / bud med gaṅ la la bud med kyi skyon brgya dag gis kun nas ñon moṅs par gyur pa / bud med kyi dṅos po la smod pa / bud med kyi skye gnas las yoṅs su thar bar 'dod pa de dag bud med kyi dṅos po las log par gyur cig / byaṅ chub kyi mthar thug gi bar du skyes pa'i dbaṅ po byuṅ bar gyur cig ces btab bo /.

[5.9] navamam tasya [ma]hāpranidhānam abhū[t]: bodhiprāpto 'ham sarvasatvā māra][1]- [2])pāśaih parimocayeyam, nānādrstigahanasamkata-prāptāh tān samyagdrstyām pratisthāpayeyam([2], anupūrvam[3] bodhisatva-cārikām[4] sandarśayeyam[5].

1) Ms. Y (fol.15a) starts here again. 2)(2 X: -pāśabandhanabaddhā nānādṛṣṭigahanasaṃkaṭṭaprāpta . sarvamārapāśadṛṣṭigatibhyo vinivartya samyagdṛṣṭau niyojyā; Y: samyagdṛṣṭyā; for acc.pl. in -āḥ see Intro.; T: (sems can thams cad bdud kyi) źags pa rnams las yoṅs su thar bar bya'o / lta ba tha dad pa mi mthun pa ziṅ ziṅ pas mi mthun par gyur pa dag yaṅ dag pa'i lta ba la dgod par bya'o /. 3) X: -ānupūrveṇa; T: mthar gyis. 4) X: bodhisatvacaryāyāṃ; T: byaṅ chub sems dpa'i spyod pa. 5) X: saṃn-; Y:-darśayeyuḥ.

[5.10] daśaman tasya mahāpraṇidhānam abhūt[1]: bodhiprāptasya[2] me ye kecit[3] satvā rājabhayabhītā[4] ye ca[5] bandhanatāḍanāvaruddhā[6] vadhyārhā[7] anekamāyābhir[8] upadrutā vimānitāḥ[9] kāyikacaitasikaduḥkhair[10] abhyāhatā, te[11] madīyena puṇyānubhāvena [12)]parimucyeran sarvopadravebhyaḥ[(12].

1) X: abhū. 2) X: inserts ca. 3) So X; Y: ket. 4) X: rājādhibhaya-. 5) X: vā. 6) X: bandhanabaddhāvaruddhā; T: (gaṅ dag) bciṅ ba daṅ / brdeg pa daṅ / go rar gźug pa daṅ. 7) X: badhyāhārā; Y: bandhyārhā; T: gsad par 'os pa. 8) X: -māyabhir. 9) X: vimānitāś ca; Y: vimānitaḥ. 10) Y:-duḥkher; T: lus daṅ ṅag daṅ sems sdug bsṅal gyis. 11) X: inserts here mama nāmadheyaṃ śravaṇā. 12)(12 X: sarvabhayopadravebhya(ḥ) parimucyeran.

[5.11] 'ekādaśamam tasya mahāpraṇidhānam abhūt: bodhiprāptasya[1] me ye kecit[2] satvā kṣudhāgninā[3] prajvalitā - āhāraparyeṣṭyabhiyuktāḥ[4] [5)]pāpaṃ karma kurvanti,[(5,6] ahaṃ teṣāṃ varṇa[7]gandharasopetenāhāreṇa śarīraṃ santarpayeyam, [8)]paścā dharmarasenātyantasukhe pratiṣṭhāpayeyam[(8].

1) X: inserts ca. 2) X: omits kecit. 3) X: kṣuddhā-; T: bkres pa daṅ skom pa'i me rab tu 'bar ba. 4) X: āhārapānaparyeṣṭya-; Y:-paryeṣṭyābhiyuktāḥ; T like Y and in spite of its preceding bkres pa daṅ skom pa'i me, has here only kha zas. 5)(5 X: tanidānaṃ pāpaṃ kurvanti. 6) X: inserts here: sace te mama nāmadheyaṃ dhārayeyur. 7) X: barṇa-. 8)(8 X omits entirely this clause, ending with santarpayeyu(r).

[5.12] [1)]dvādaśaman tasya tathāgatasya idaṃ mahāpraṇidhānam a(bhūt)[1)]: bodhiprāptasya[2] me[3] ye kecit satvā nagnā[4] vasanavirahitā[5] daridrā[6] śītoṣṇadaṃśamaśakai[7] rātriṃdivaṃ[8] [9)]duḥkhāṃ vedanāṃ vedanti[(9,10], aham

teṣām vastrāparibhogam[11] upanāmayeyam[12] nānāraṅgarakt(x)xxxx[13] vividhaiś ca ratnābharaṇavibhūṣaṇamāl(y)agandhavilepanavādyatūryatāḍāvacaraiḥ[14] sarvasatvānām sarvābhiprāyān paripūrayeyam.

1)(1X: dvādaśamam tasya mahāpraṇidhānam abhūt. 2)X: inserts ca. 3)T this time drops bdag byaṅ chub thob pa na from its otherwise strict formulaic expression of these vows. 4)X: omits nagnā. 5)X: vyasana-. 6)T inserts / sdug bsṅal ba/. 7)X: -maśaker, then adds upadrutā. 8)X: tṛndrivaṃ; Y: -divai. 9)(9X: duḥkham anubhavanti; Y: duḥkhāṃ vedanāṃ vimdya; T: sdug bsṅal gyi tshor ba myoṅ ba. 10)X: inserts here sace te mama nāmadheyamn dhārayeyur. 11)X: vasra-. 12)X: upasaṃhareyaṃ. 13)X: nānāraṅgaraktāny-xxmānupanāxyeyaṃ (vividhaiś); Y: nānāraṅga(rakt-x)xxxx (vividhaiś); Dutt gives Y (= C) as: nānāraṅgairaktāṃ ca kāmānupa-*, but the last, and therefore important part of this is impossible; T: (gos yoṅs su spyad par 'os pa [= paribhogya ?])tshon sna tshogs su kha bsgyur ba (dag sbyin par bya'o / ji ltar 'dod pa bźin du rin po che'i rgyan sna tshogs daṅ / etc.). 14)X: ratnābhāraṇagandhamālya-.

[5.13] imāni dvādaśa mahāpraṇi[dhānāni sa bha][1]gavān [2][bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabhas tathāgato .rhan samyaksambuddhaḥ pūrvam bodhi(satva)cārikāṃ caran kṛtavān.

1)So X; Y is obliterated. 2)It is clear from both X and T that Y is here faulty: X (sa bhagavāṃd)bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabhos tathāgatorhat samyaksaṃbuddha pūrvaṃ bodhicārikāṃ carata kṛtavāṃ [6] tasya khalu puna maṃjuśrīr bhagavato... T: 'jam dpal / bcom ldan 'das de bźin gśegs pa dgra bcom pa yaṅ dag par rdzogs pa'i saṅs rgyas sman gyi bla bai ḍū rya'i 'od de sṅon byaṅ chub sems dpa'i spyad pa spyod pa na smon lam chen po bcu gñis po de dag btab par gyur to / [6] 'jam dpal / de bźin gśegs pa ... The situation in Y is fairly transparent. As not infrequently happens in our Mss. when a string of words is closely followed by the same or a similar string, the two often become fused into one, and the material separating them is omitted. Thus the scribe of Y starts with the first bhagavant, omits everything following it up to and including the second bhagavant, and then writes after the first what should have come after the second and continues in this way. This accounts for Y's bhagavān (nom.) bhaiṣajyaguruprabhasya (gen.) tathāgatasya (gen.). In the bracketed material we have put in parenthesis those cases where X does not agree with T: T has -satva-, X omits; X has khalu punar, T omits.

[6] tasya (khalu punar) maṃjuśrīr bhagavato] bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūrya-
prabhasya tathāgatasya yat praṇidhānaṃ yac ca[1] buddhakṣetraguṇavyūhaṃ
na tac chakyaṃ[2] kalpena vā kalpāvaśeṣeṇa vā kṣapayituṃ; [3][ekato]
[4)][pa]riśuddhaṃ tad buddhakṣetraṃ[(4] apagatakāmadoṣam[5] apagatāpāyaduḥ-
khaśabdam[6] apagatamātṛgrāmam[7]; vaiḍūryamayī ca sā pṛthivī[8], kuḍya-
prāsādatoraṇagavākṣajālaniryūhāḥ[9] saptaratnamayā[ḥ] stambhakhoṭa-
kāḥ[10]. [11)]yādṛśī sukhāvatī lokadhātus tādṛśā sā vaiḍūryanirbhāsā loka-
dhātuḥ.[(11] [12)]tatra ca lokadhātau[(12] dvau[13] bodhisatvau mahāsatvau
teṣāṃ aprameyāṇām[14] asaṃkhyeyānāṃ bodhisatvānām[15] pramukhau,[16]$_{\alpha}$ eka[ḥ]
sūryavairocano nāma[17]$_{\alpha}$, dvitīyaś[18] candravairocano,[19]$_{\alpha}$ yau[20] tasya
bhagavato bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya saddharmakośaṃ[21]
dhārayataḥ.[22] tasmāt tarhi maṃjuśrīḥ[23] śrāddhena kulaputreṇa vā kula-
duhitrā[24] vā tatra [25)]buddhakṣetropapattau praṇidhānaṃ kartavyam[(25]$_{\alpha}$.

1) X: ya ca. 2) X: -vyūhaṃs taṃ na śakyaṃ. 3) This is very uncertain. Y is partially obliterated: e(k)(x)t(x), but -t- could be subscribed as a part of a lost ligature judging by its shape; X has nothing corresponding to this; T: śin tu. 4)(4 X: omits; Y: -kṣetraṃm; T: saṅs rgyas kyi źiṅ de ni śin tu yoṅs su dag pa ste / [to this point agreeing with Y, but then adds:] rdo daṅ / gseg ma daṅ / gyo mo med pa /. 5) X: egata-; T: 'dod pa'i skyon med pa, taking kāmadoṣa as a gen. tatpuruṣa. 6) T: ṅan soṅ daṅ / sdug bsṅal gyi sgra med pa, taking -āpāyaduḥkha as a dvandva; Y: -śabdaṃm. 7) Y: mātri-; T: bud med kyi dṅos po med pa = apagatastrībhāva; cf [12]. 8) X: mahāpṛthivī. 9) X: kuḍyaprākāraprāsāda- ... - niryūhā; T includes prākāra- = ra ba, but omits prāsāda-. 10) X: omits stambhakhoṭakāḥ. In T the whole clause is handled differently: sa daṅ / rtsig pa daṅ / ra ba daṅ / rta babs daṅ / skar khuṅ gi dra ba daṅ / ba gam ni bai ḍū rya'i raṅ bźin can / pu śu ni rin po che sna bdun gyi raṅ bźin can te /, suggesting that our pṛthivī should be in compound with kuḍya, etc., and that vaiḍūryamayī should modify this, while saptaratnamayā[ḥ] should refer to stambhakhoṭakāḥ only. 11)(11 X: yādṛś(x) sukhāvatī lokadhātus tādṛśa (tatra vaiḍūryanirbhāsayāṃ lokadhatau dau bodhisatvau..); an omission of the kind noted at 5.13 n.2. T: 'jig rten gyi khams bde ba can di 'dra ba de bźin du/'jig rten gyi khams bai ḍū ryar snaṅ ba'i saṅs rgyas kyi źiṅ gi yon tan bkod pa yaṅ de daṅ 'dra 'o /. 12)(12 X: tatra vaiḍūryanirbhāsāyāṃ lokadhātau, see note 11. 13) X: dau.

14)X: -ānām. 15)X: inserts mahāsatvānām. 16)X: -mukho. 17)X: nāmnā. 18)Ms. Z fol. 8a begins here -tīyaś. 19)Z: -vairocana. 20)X,Z: yo; Y: ye, but the latter puts the verb in the dual. 21)X: -kośamn; Z: -kośan. 22)Z: -yanti. 23)X,Z: -śrī. 24)X: -duhitā. 25)(25X: -opapannau praṇidhāna karaṇīyaṃ; Y: buddhakṣetraṃ praṇidhānaṃ kartavyaṃ; Z: -opapattau praṇidhānaṃ karaṇīyaṃ; T: saṅs rgyas kyi źiṅ der skye bar smon lam thob cig / BHSD gives upapatti as fem.

[7] punar api[1] bhagavān[2] maṃjuśriyaṃ[3] kumārabhūtam āmantrayati sma[4]α: santi[5] maṃjuśrīḥ[6,7] satvā[8] ye[9] na jānanti[10] kuśalākuśalaṃ karmaṃ[11,12] lobhābhibhūtā[13], ajānanto[14] dānan[15] dānasya [ca][16] phalavipākaṃ, 17)[bālā] mūrkhā(17 śraddhendriyavikalā dhanasaṃcayarakṣaṇābhiyuktā[18]α na ca[19] dānasaṃvibhāge[20] teṣām[21] cittaṃ[22] krāmate[23]α; dānakāle upasthite svaśarīramāṃsacchedana[24] ivānāttamanaso[25] bhavanti[26]. 27)aneke ca te satvā ye(27 svayam evātmana[28] na paribhuṃjanti,[29]α, [30] prāg eva 31)dāsadāsīkarmakarāṇām, prāg evānyeṣām yācanakānām(31; te tādṛśā satvā itaś cyutvā[32] pretaloke upapatsyante[33]α yadi vā tiryagyonau[34] yai[35] pūrvaṃ manuṣyabhūtaiḥ[36] śrutaṃ bhaviṣyati tasya bhagavato bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya nāmadheyaṃ, tatra teṣāṃ yamaloke[37] sthitānāṃ vā[38] tiryagyonau[39] sthitānāṃ vā tasya tathāgatasya nāma āmukhībhaviṣyati.α saha smaritamātreṇa[40] tataś cyutvā[41] punar api manuṣyaloke upapatsyanti,[42]α jātismarāś ca bhaviṣyanti[43]α, [44] durgatibhayabhītā na bhūyaḥ kāmaguṇair[45] arthikā,[46] dānābhiratā[47] dānasya ca varṇavāditāḥ[48] sarvāstiparityāgino 'nupūrveṇa[49] 50)śīrṣakaracaraṇanayanasvamāṃsaśoṇitaṃ(50 yācanakānāṃ pradāsyanti,[51] prāg evānyaṃ[52] dhanaskandham.∞

1)Z: punaraparam; T: yaṅ. 2)X,Z: bhagavām. 3)Z: māṃjuśrīye. 4)Z: omits sma. 5)X: sati. 6)X,Z: śrī. 7)X: inserts pṛthagmanāx before satvā; Z: likewise pṛthagjanāṃ; T: (sems can) so so'i skye bo. 8)Y: satvāḥ. 9)Z: yena. 10)X: jānati. 11)X: karma; T omits karmaṃ. 12)X,Z insert te. 13)Y: -bhūtāḥ. 14)X: ajānato. 15)X: dāna. 16)Y omits ca. 17)(17X: bālāgrā mūrdhā; Y: mūr(kh)ā; Z: te balā mūrkhā; T: de dag ni byis pa glen pa. 18)Z: -sacaya-; T: nor sog ciṅ sruṅ ba la mṅon par brtson gyi /. 19)X: inserts teṣām.

20)X: -vibhāgaṃ. 21)X: omits teṣāṃ; see n.19. 22)X: citaṃ. 23)X,Z: krāmati. 24)Y: -cheda; Z: -chedanam. 25)X: tāmanaso; Z: anāttamanā. 26)X,Y: bhavati. 27)(27X: aneke ca satvā ye; Y: anekāni ca te satvā ye; Z: anekāni ca satvāni; T: sems can de dag ... du ma. 28)X: omits ātmana; Z: ātmanā; T has only bdag ñid kyaṅ for svayam evātmana. 29)X: -bhuṃjati. 30) X: inserts prāg eva mātāpitrīṇāṃ dāsyanti; Z: prāg eva mātāpitrīṇāṃ bhāryāputraduhitrīṇāṃ dāsyaṃti; dāsyaṃti is added as a correction beneath the line; T follows Z. 31)(31In Z this is written in a smaller hand and partially below the line. 32)X,Z: cavitvā. 33)X: -syate; Z: -syanti. 34)X: -yoni; Y: -yone. 35)Y: ye. 36)X: -bhūtai; Z: manuṣyanuṣyabhūtaiḥ. 37)X,Z: yamalokasthitānāṃ. 38)X: omits vā. 39)X,Z: tiryagyonisthitānāṃ. 40)X,Z: smaraṇa-. 41)X: taś cavitvā; Z: xtaś cavitvā. 42)X: -syate. 43)X: -ṣyati; Y: -ṣyaṃti. 44)X: inserts te ca; Z: te. 45)X: karmaguṇebhir; Z: -guṇebhir. 46)X: inserts bhaviṣyati, Z: -°anti; T: 'dod pa'i yon tan dag don du mi gñer ba daṅ /. 47)X: inserts -ś ca bhaviṣyati, Z: -°anti. 48)X: -vādina; Z: -vādino. 49)X: -parityāgina . anu-; Y: -parityāginaunu-; Z: sarvāsthipatyāginaḥ anu-. 50)(50X: karacaraṇaśīrṣanayanasvamāṃxśoṇitaṃ; Y: śīra-; Z: -caṇa-; T: raṅ gi mgo daṅ / lag pa daṅ /, etc. 51)X: anupradāsyati; Z: anupradāsyanti. 52)C: -ānya.

[8] punar aparaṃ maṃjuśrīh[1] santi satvā ye tathāgatānāṃ[2] uddiśya[3] śikṣāpadaṃ[4] dhārayanti[5], 6) śīlavipannā ācāravipannāḥ dṛṣṭivipannā; ye punaḥ śīlavantaḥ te śīlaṃ rakṣanti6) na[7] bāhuśrutyaṃ[8] paryeṣanti[9] na ca tathāgatānāṃ[10] sūtrāntānāṃ gambhīraṃ[11] arthaṃ vijānanti[12]; ye ca[13] bahuśrutās[14] te 'bhimānikā[15] bhaviṣyanti, mānastabdhāḥ[16] 17)sarveṣāṃ dviṣṭāḥ17), saddharmaṃ[18] avamanyanti[19] pratikṣipanti[20]. mārapakṣikās te tādṛśā mohapuruṣāḥ svayaṃ kumārgapratipannāḥ[21] anyāni[22] cānekāni satvakoṭīnayutaśatasahasrāṇi[23] mahāprapātaṃ[24] prapātayanti[25]. teṣāṃ[26] evaṃrūpāṇāṃ satvānāṃ bhūyiṣṭataraṃ[27] narakagatir[28] bhaviṣyati[29]. yai[30] śrutaṃ bhaviṣyati[31] tasya bhagavato bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya nāmadheyaṃ, teṣāṃ tatra narake sthitānāṃ buddhānubhāvena tasya[32] tathāgatasya nāma[33] āmukhībhaviṣyati[34]. 35)te tataś cyutvā(35 punar api manuṣyaloke upapatsyanti[36] samyagdṛṣṭikā[37] vīryavantaḥ[38] kalyāṇāśayās[39] te gṛhān[40] utsṛjya[41] tathāgatānāṃ śāsane[42] pravrajitvānupūrveṇa[43] bodhisatvacārikāṃ cariṣyanti[44].

[1] X,Y: -śrī. [2] X: tathāgatān; Z: -gatānāmm. [3] X,Y: udiśya; T omits. [4] X,Z: śikṣāpadāni. [5] X: -ayati; Z omits dhārayanti; T see next note. [6](6 X: te śīlavipatim āpadyate dṛṣtivipatim ācāravipatiṃ vā kadācid āpadyate śīlavipanā ye ye puna śīlavanto bhavati śīlaṃ rakṣati; Z is even further expanded: te śīlavipatim āpadyate dṛṣṭivipattim ācā[ra]vipatti vā kādācid āpadyante te śīlavipannāḥ ācāravipannāḥ driṣṭivipannā y[e][pu]naḥ śīlavantaḥ te śīlaṃ rakṣanti; T (for the whole of [8] up to and including rakṣanti) 'jam dpal / gźan yaṅ / sems can gaṅ dag de bźin gśegs pa rnams kyi bslab pa'i gnas 'jig pa dag yod de / de dag tshul khrims log par źugs śiṅ lta ba log par źugs nas/gaṅ dag tshul khrims daṅ ldan pa de dag ni tshul khrims sruṅ gi. The context as well as T 'jig pa might suggest that dhārayanti be taken in the sense of "suppress, resist" (MWD 519[1]); all versions of *StP*, however, read 'dzin pa. [7] X and Z insert puna. [8] X: bahuśrutam. [9] Z: paryeṣiṣanti. [10] X,Z: tathāgatabhāṣitānām. [11] X: gabhīram. [12] X,Z: ājānanti; T: (mi) śes. [13] Z: inserts puna. [14] X: -śrutas. [15] X: mānikā; Z: abhi-°. [16] X: māna-stambdhā; Z: -stabdhā; T: ṅa rgyal gyis non pas. [17](17 X: pareṣāṃ, omitting dviṣṭāḥ; Z: pareṣān dviṣṭā; T: gźan dag la phrag dog byed ciṅ. [18] X: sa-dharmaṃ. [19] X: manyāti; T: dbaṅ za bar 'gyur. [20] X: -pati; Y: -paṃti [21] Y: kumārgaḥprati-. [22] Z: anye. [23] Z: -niyuta-. [24] X: mahāpraṇixtaṃ; T: g-yaṅ sa chen por. [25] X: prapāta. [26] X: inserts yat before teṣām. [27] X: bhūhstena. [28] X: narakavāsagatiṃr; Z: -vāsagatir. [29] T (for the whole sentence): sems can de lta bu de dag ni sems can dmyal ba mi bzad par 'gro bar 'gyur ro /. [30] X: has tatra yes for yai. [31] X: here śrutaṃ bhaviṣyati is transposed to the end of the sentence. [32] X: has sa instead; Z: tasya tasya. [33] X: nāmadheya. [34] T for this sentence is essentially the same except for the first clause which has gaṅ dag sṅon mir gyur pa na bcom ldan 'das de bźin gśegs pa sman gyi bla bai dū rya'i 'od de'i mtshan thos par gyur pa ... cf. [7]: yai pūrvaṃ manuṣyabhūtaiḥ śrutaṃ bhaviṣyati. [35](35 X: teścavitvā; Z: te tataś cavitvā. [36] X: -syate. [37] X: -dṛṣṭau. [38] X: omits. [39] Z: -āśayā. [40] X: gṛhāṇy. [41] X: utsyaja. [42] X: tathāgataśāsane. [43] Z: -jitvā anupūrveṇa. [44] X: paripūrayiṣyanti; Y: cariṣyati; Z: obliterated, but length of gap favors cariṣyanti.

[9] punar aparaṃ maṃjuśrī santi satvā ye ātmanasya[1] varṇaṃ[2] bhāṣanti, [3] pareṣāṃ mātsaryeṇāvarṇaṃ niścārayanti[(3]; te[4] ātmotkarṣakāḥ[5] satvāḥ[6] [7] parapaṃsakā tṛṣv apāyeṣu[(7] bahūni varṣasahasrāṇi duḥkham anubhaviṣyanti[8]; te 'nekānāṃ[9] varṣasahasrāṇām atyayena [10] tataś cyutvā[(10] go['] ś-

voṣṭragardabhādiṣu[11] tiryagyoniṣūpapadyante[12]; kaśadaṇḍaprahārais[13] tāḍitā[14] kṣuttarṣa[pīḍita][15]-śarīrā mahantaṃ bhāraṃ vahamānā[16] mārgaṃ gamiṣyanti[17]. yadi kadācit manuṣyapratilābhaṃ lapsyanti[18], 19)[te nityakālaṃ nīcakuleṣūpapatsyanti, dāsatve paravaśagā bhaviṣyanti.](19 yaiḥ[20] śrutaṃ[21] pūrvaṃ[22] manuṣyabhūtais[23] tasya[24] bhagavato bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya nāmadheyam[25] etena[26] kuśalamūlena[27] sarvaduḥkhebhyaḥ[28] parimokṣyanti[29]. tīkṣṇendriyā[30] bhaviṣyanti[31] paṇḍitā vyaktā medhāvinaḥ[32] kuśalamūlaparyeṣaṇābhiyuktā[33] nityaṃ[34] kalyāṇamitrasamavadhānaṃ[35] pratilabhiṣyanti[36]. cchindanti[37] mārapāśaṃ bhindanti[38] vidyāṇḍakośaṃ[39] ucchoṣayanti[40] kleśanadīṃ[41] parimucyanti jātijarāmaraṇaśokaduḥkhadaurmanasyopāyāsebhyaḥ[42].

1) X: ātmanaṃ. 2) X: varṇa. 3)(3 X: matsariṇax pareṣāmm avarṇaṃ niscārayati; Z: mostly obliterated, but ...ś[c]ārayi[ṣ]...; T: phrag dog gis gźan dag la mi sñan par brjod pa yod de /. 4) X: omits; Z: ob. 5) X: ātmakarṣakā. 6) X: satvā. 7)(7 X: paraspaxxsaskṛtopāyaiṣu. 8) X: sing; Z: pres. 9) X,Z: ("Z" written in beneath the line): te anekānāṃ. 10)(10 X: taścavitvā; Z: tatas cavitvā. 11) X: gavāśvoṣṭragardabhādibhi; Z: go-aśvanuṣṭraxx... 12) X: -yate. 13) X: daśādaṇḍaprahāreṇa; Y: -prahāres. 14) Y: tāḍita. 15) X: kṣutarṣapīḍitā (śarīrā); Y: kṣuttarṣaśarīrā; Z: kṣutarṣapaxx... [Ms.Z here is confused; a single line of writing seems suddenly to branch into two lines ?]; T: bkres pa daṅ / skom pas lus ñen pa daṅ /. 16) X: vahamānāṃ; Y: vahamāna. 17) X: gacchati; Z: gacchanti; T: 'gro bar 'gyur ro. 18) X: pratilapsyati; Z: pratilapsyante; T (for the whole of clause differs somewhat): gal te brgya la mi'i skye ba rñed na. 19)(19 X: ...-ūpapatsyate... ca paravaśagatā bhaviṣyati; Y: omits the entire clause; since Y has the first clause of the sentence, this omission probably represents a scribal error and not a legitimate redactional difference. 20) X,Y: ye. 21) X: omits but cf. n.25; Y: śruta. 22) Y: pūrvam; Z: pūrve. 23) Z: -bhūtai. 24) Ms. X is here badly muddled; the scribe repeats - fused together - parts of fol. 15a.5 to 15b.2, and 15b.3: ta kṣutapīḍiśarā mahantaṃ bhāraṃ vahamānaṃ paravaśagatā bhaviṣyanti ye pūrva manuṣyabhūtais tasya. 25) X: here inserts śrutaṃ bhaviṣyati; Y: -dheyamm. 26) X: tena. 27) Z: kuśalena. 28) X,Z: -ebhya. 29) X: paxxkṣyante. 30) X: -yaś ca. 31) X: -iṣyati. 32) X: medhāvi ca; Z: medhāvina. 33) X: -paryeṣṭyibhiyuktā; Y: -yuktāḥ. 34) X inserts ca. 35) X:

-vandhānaṃ. 36) X: lanpsyati; Z: lapsyanti. 37) X: see n.42; Z: cchepsyanti. 38) X: see n.42; Z: bhidyanti. 39) T: ma rig pa'i, suggesting that we should read avidyā-; but there is not the slightest indication in any of the three Mss. which would support such a reading. 40) Y: -yati. 41) Z: -nadī. 42) Z: jātijarāvyādhimaraṇaśokaparidevaduḥkhadaur[mana]syopāyāsebhyaḥ; T: skye ba daṅ / rga śi daṅ / mya ṅan daṅ / smre sṅags 'don pa daṅ / sdug bsṅal ba daṅ / yid mi bde ba daṅ / 'khrug pa rnams las. Beginning with cchindanti X treats the whole passage in a somewhat different way: mārapāśa bhindya vidyāṇḍakośaṃ ucchoṣayati kleśanadīm ucchoṣayati jātijarāvyādhimaṇaṇaxxśoka paridevaduḥkhadaurmanasyopāsebhyaḥ.

[10] punar aparaṃ maṃjuśrīḥ[1] santi satvā ye[2] paiśunyābhiratāḥ[3] satvānāṃ parasparaṃ kalahavigrahavivādāṃ[4] kārāpayanti[5], te parasparaṃ vigrahītacittāḥ[6] satvā nānāvidham[7] akuśalam abhisaṃskurvanti[8] kāyena vācā manasānyonyāhitakāmā[9] nityaṃ parasparam anarthāya[10] parākramanti[11]. te vanadevatām[12] āvāhayanti[13]; vṛkṣadevatā giridevatā śmasāneṣu pṛthak-pṛthagbhūtānām[14] āvāhayanti[15] tiryagyonigatānām[16] prāṇināṃ[17] jīvitād[18] vyavaropayanti[19] māṃsarudhirabhakṣā[20] yakṣarākṣasān[21] pūjayanti. tasya śatrusya[22] nāmaṃ vā śarīrapratimāṃ vā kṛtvā[23] tatra ghoravidyāṃ[24] sādhayanti[25] kākhordavetāḍaprayogena[26,27] jīvitāntarāyam vā śarīra-vināśaṃ[28] vā kartukāmā; yai[29] śrutaṃ bhaviṣyati[30] tasya bhagavato bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabhasya[31] tathāgatasya nāmadheyam, teṣāṃ[32] na śakyaṃ[33] kenacid[34] antarāyaṃ kartum[35] te[36] parasparaṃ[37] maitracittā[38] hitacittā[39] avyāpādacittā[40] viharanti[41]; svakasvakena parigraheṇa[42] saṃtuṣṭā.

1) X,Z: -śrī. 2) X: omits ye. 3) X,Y: -ābhiratā. 4) X: -vivādāt; Y: -vivādā. 5) X: -ayati; Z: kurvanti. 6) X: vigrahacittā. 7) X: vidhamam a-. 8) X: -vati. 9) X: -manasā anyonyam ahitakāx; Z: -manasā anyonya ahitakamāx. 10) X: para[spara]m [a]rthāya; Z: paraspa(na)rthāya. 11) X: -ati. 12) X: omits vana- and inserts ca after te. The ending -ām is here problematic; perhaps read: -devatā-m-āvā-, taking -m- as a hiatus-bridger; or take it as a case of anusvāra for visarga and read: -devatāḥ āvā-. 13) X: -yati. 14) X: pṛthapṛthagbhūtānāvāhayati; Y: pṛthakpṛthagbhūtānāṃmāvāhayanti; Z: pṛthagbhūtānā-

(mā)vāhayanti, -(mā)- is a correction added below the line. The gen.pl. of -bhūta is problematic, but it is difficult to justify emending it. Y is clear and Z has been corrected to -ānāṃ. 15)T structures the sentence differently: de dag nags tshal gyi lha daṅ / śiṅ gi lha daṅ / ri'i lha 'gugs par byed / dur khrod rnams su 'byuṅ po tha dad pa dag 'gugs par byed /. All three Mss., on the other hand, agree in punctuating te vanadevatām āvāhayanti as one unit, and vṛkṣadevatā giridevatā śmasāneṣu pṛthakpṛthag-bhūtānām āvāhayanti as another. This consistency among the Mss. is unusual. On acc.pl. in -ā see Introduction. 16)X: -yonigatāś; Z: -yonigata-. 17)X: prāṇino; Z: -prāṇinā; T: (dud 'gro'i skye gnas su soṅ ba'i) srog chags rnams kyi (srog gcod ciṅ). 18)X,Z: jīvitā. 19)X: -ati. 20)X: -bhakṣānya; Z: -bhakṣa. 21)X: -rākṣakṣasyāṃ(?); Z: -rākṣasāṃ. 22)X: śastro; Z: śatrosya. For -usya, BHSG 12.35. 23)T differs slightly: dgra bo de'i miṅ nas brjod pa 'am / gzugs byas nas. 24)T: rig sṅags drag po. 25)X,Y:-yati. 26)X: prayogaina; Ms.Z fol.11b ends here and fol.12 now appears to be lost. All Mss. have the form -vetāḍa, cf. BHSD 508[1]. 27)After -prayogena Y has an akṣara which could be read as vā, tā or even cā; X has nothing here. 28)X: śarīrādhikṣepaṃ, instead. 29)X: yai punas; Y: ye. 30)X puts śrutaṃ bhaviṣyati at the end of this clause after ... tathāgatasya nāmadheyaṃ. See also next note. 31)Ms.V - consisting of a single leaf - begins with bhaiṣajya-guruvaiḍūryaprabhasya... It too places śrutaṃ bhaviṣyati at the end of the clause. 32)X: teṣā; Y: tasya. 33)V: omits śakyam. 34)X: kena(ntarāyaṃ). 35)X: kartu. 36)V: sarve te; X: sarve ca te. 37)V: paramparaṃ. 38)X: maitracita. 39)V: hittā = ? hi[taci]ttā. 40)V: avyāpannacittā; X: avyā-pannacitā. 41)X: -ati. 42)Y: pagraheṇa.

[11] punar aparam[1 2)]ete catvāraḥ pariṣā[(2] bhikṣubhikṣunyupāsakopāsikā;[3,4] ye ca[5] śrāddhāḥ[6] kulaputrā[7] vā kuladuhitā[8] vāstāṃgasamanvāgatam[9] upavāsam upavasanti[10 α], ekavārṣikam[11] vā traimāsikam[12] vā[α] śikṣāpadan[13] dhārayanti[14 α], yeṣām [15)]evābhiprāyam evaṃ praṇidhānam[(15]: anena vayam kuśalamūlena paścimāyām[16] diśāyām[17] sukhāvatyām lokadhātāv[18] upapadyema[19 α] yatrāmitāyus[20] tathāgataḥ[21]; yaiḥ[22] punaḥ[23] śrutam bhaviṣyati[24 α] tasya bhagavato[25] bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabhasya[26] tathāgatasya[27] nāmadheyaṃ, teṣām[28] maraṇakālasamaye aṣṭau[29] bodhisatvā ṛddhyā[30]-āgatvā[31] mārgaṃ[32] upadarśayiṣyanti[33 α], te[34] tatra nānāraṃgeṣu[35] padmeṣūpapādukā[36]

prādurbhaviṣyanti[37]. kecit[38] punar[39] devaloke[40] upapatsyanti[41], teṣām[42] tatropapannānām[43] tatpūrvam[44] kuśalamūlam[45] na kṣīyati[46], na ca[47] durgatigamanam[48] bhaviṣyati[49]. [50)]te tataś cyutveha[(50] manuṣyaloke[51] rājāno bhaviṣyanti[52] [53)]caturdvīpeśvarāś cakravartino[(53] 'nekāni[54] satvakoṭīniyutaśatasahasrāṇi[55] daśasu[56] kuśaleṣu karmapatheṣu[57] pratiṣṭhāpayiṣyanti[58]. apare punaḥ[59] kṣatriyamahāśālakuleṣu[60] gṛhapatimahāśālakuleṣu[61] brāhmaṇamahāśālakuleṣu[62] prabhūtadhanadhānyakośakoṣṭhāgārasamṛddheṣu[63] [64] kuleṣūpapatsyanti[65]. te[66] [67)]rūpasampannā aiśvaryasampannā parivārasampannā śūrā vīrā mahānagnabalavegadhāriṇo bhaviṣyanti[(67].

1) V,Y: -īḥ. 2)(2 V: etāś carasraḥ pariṣado; X: etāś catasra·parṣado. 3) Y: -āḥ. 4) Śikṣ 175.3 begins here. 5) V,X,Śikṣ insert -ānye; T: gźan yaṅ, which very frequently in our text translates punar aparam. 6) V,X: -ā. 7) X: -putro. 8) X,Śikṣ: -duhitaro. 9) X: āryāṣṭāṃṅgasamanvāgato. 10) X: sing. 11) V: ekavarṣam; Y: ekavarṣikam. 12) V: traimāsa(m); Y: tremāsikam; Śikṣ: traivārṣikam. 13) V,X,Śikṣ: -am. 14) X: dhārayiṣyati. 15)(15 V: eva praṇidhānam evābhiprāyan; X: evam praṇidhānam evābhiprāyam; Śikṣ: evam abhiprāyaḥ evam praṇidhānam. Y has praṇinam for praṇidhānam. 16) V: paścimāṃyam. 17) V,X: diśi. 18) V,Śikṣ: -dhātau; X: -dhāto. 19) V,X: -emaḥ; Y: upapadyate. 20) V: yatramitāyu; Śikṣ: -āmitābhas. 21) T (for the text beginning with yeṣām and ending here): gaṅ dag gis bsam pas bdag gis dge ba'i rtsa ba 'dis nub phyogs gaṅ na de bźin gśegs pa tshe dpag med bźugs pa'i jig rten gyi khams bde ba can du skye bar śog śig ces smon lam de lta bu btab pa dag las /. 22) V: yais; X: yai; Y: ye. 23) V,Śikṣ: omit; X: punas (tasya). 24) V and X put śrutam bhaviṣyati at the end of the clause after nāmadheyam. 25) X: bhagavate. 26) Śikṣ here has bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabhavājasya which is undoubtedly a misprint for -prabharājasya. Śikṣ everywhere in its quotations from *Bhg* adds -rāja to the name. 27) X: tathāgatāgatasya. 28) V: teṣā. 29) Śikṣ: 'ṣṭau. 30) V,Y: ridhyā; X: (ṛ)dhyā; T: rdzu 'phrul gyis. 31) X: gatām (this reading seems to result from the fact that X has omitted the mārgam of V, Y and Śikṣ and thus has had to make gatām the object of the following vb. 32) X: omits. 33) X: upadarśayati; Śikṣ: upadarśayanti. 34) V: teṣām; X: obl. 35) X: -ramgaiṣu. 36) X: padmeṣuḥpapādukā; Śikṣ: -dukāḥ; T: translates the loc. of padma by las. 37) X: sing; Śikṣ: prādurbhavanti. 38) V: kecid; Y: keci; Z fol.13a begins here. 39) X,Z: puna.

40)V,Śikṣ: -loka. 41)V,Śikṣ: upapadyante; X: upapadyate; T: skye bar 'gyur ba. 42)Z inserts a ca. 43)T: skyes nas. 44)V: tat(kuśala-); X: pūrvakaṃ; Śikṣ: tatpūrvakaṃ; T: sṅon gyi dge ba'i rtsa ba de. 45)V: tatkuśalamūlaṃ; X: -mūlai; Z: ..xxla. 46)V,X,Z,Śikṣ: -ate. 47)V: omits ca. 48)V,X: -gāmino. 49)V: pl.; Śikṣ, for the whole clause, differs somewhat: durgativinipātabhayaṃ ca na bhaviṣyati. 50)(50V: tataḥś cyutvā iha; X: te taś cavitvā iha; Śikṣ: te tataś cyutvā iha; T adds kyaṅ but omits te. 51)V: -loka upapatsyate; X: -loke upapatsyate; Z: -loke upapatsyanti. 52)X,Y: sing.; Z: bhavanti; Śikṣ: bhavanti. 53)(53V: (cakra)dvīpeśva(x)varttinaḥ; X: caturdīpeśvarāś cakravartina; Y: caturdvīśvarāś cakraxx... 54)V: te anekāni; X: te nekāni. 55)V: -nayuta-; Y: omits -niyuta-. 56)Śikṣ: daśa. 57)X: -pathaiṣu. 58)X: pratiṣṭhāpayati; Y: sing.; Śikṣ: pratiṣṭhāpayanti. 59)X: puna. 60)V: kṣatryamahāśālakulesūpa(t-)xx... [= upatsyante ?]; T: (khyim dag tu) skye bar 'gyur. 61)V: -kule; X,Z,T reverse the order of gṛhapati- and brahmaṇa-. 62)V: -kule. 63)Z: -koṣṭā-; Śikṣ has -kuleṣu in the place of samṛddheṣu. 64)X: inserts a ca. 65)X: obl.; Z: obl.; Śikṣ: -ūpapadyante. 66)V: omits te. 67)(67V: rūpasaṃpannāś ca bhaviṣyaṃti aiśvaryasaṃpannāś ca bhaviṣyaṃti parivārasap(-x)xxxrāś ca virāś ca mahānagnabalā mahāgan(dha)dhāriṇāś ca bhaviṣyati; X: rū[pa]sampannāḥś ca bhaviṣyati aiśvaryasaṃpanāś ca bhaveyuḥ parivārasaṃpannāś ca bhaviṣyati śūrāś ca vīrāś ca mahāvalavegadhāriṇāś ca bhaviṣyati; Z: ...xxpannāś ca bhaviṣyanti parivārasaṃpannaśūxxx...; Śikṣ: rūpasaṃpannā bhavanti parivārasaṃpannā bhavanti; T: gzugs phun sum tshogs pa daṅ / dbaṅ phyug phun sum tshogs pa daṅ / yog phun sum tshogs pa daṅ / dpa' ba daṅ / rtul phod pa daṅ / tshan po che chen po'i stobs kyi śugs daṅ ldan par 'gyur ro /.

[12] yena[1] punar[2 3)]mātṛgrāmeṇa tasya tathāgatasya nāmadheyaṃ śrutaṃ bhaviṣyati[α] udgṛhītaṃ sa tasya paścimo mātṛgrāmabhāvaḥ pratikāṃkṣitavyaḥ[(3] [ω].

1)V,X: yaś; Y: ye. 2)V,X: ca; Śikṣ: ca punar; T: omits. 3)V: mātṛgrāmaṃ tasya tathāgatasya (nāmo)dgṛhīṣyaṃti tasya eva paścimaka strībhāvaḥ pratikāṃkṣitavyaḥ; X: mātṛgrā(x)ma tasya bhagavato bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya nāmadheyaṃ śrutvāṃ codgṛhīṣyanti tasya sa eva paścimastrībhāva pratikākṣitavya(ḥ); Y: in both occurrences of the term Y has mātri- for mātṛ-; Z: mātṛgrāmeṇa tasya tathāgatathāgatasya nāxxx ...

...xxxṣyati udgṛhītaṃ sa eva tasya paścimaṃ mātṛgrām(x)xxx...; Śikṣ follows Y except that it inserts bhagavato bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabharājasya between tasya and tathāgatasya, and vā after udgṛhītam; T: bud med gaṅ gis de bźin gśegs pa de'i mtshan thos śiṅ bzuṅ ba de'i bud med kyi dṅos po de tha ma yin par śes par bya'o /.

[13] atha khalu maṃjuśrīḥ[1] kumārabhūto bhagavantam etad avocat: ahaṃ bhagavan[2] paścime kāle paścime[3] samaye teṣāṃ śrāddhānāṃ kulaputrāṇāṃ kuladuhitrīṇāṃ ca[4] tasya bhagavato bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya nāmadheyaṃ nānopāyai[5] saṃśrāvayiṣyāmy[6] antaśaḥ[7] svapnāntaragatānām[8] api buddhanāmaṃ[9] karṇapuṭeṣūpasaṃhariṣyāmi.[10] ye idaṃ[11] sūtraṃ[12] dhārayiṣyanti[13] vācayiṣyanti[13] deśayiṣyanti[13,14] parebhyo[15] vistareṇa saṃprakāśayiṣyanti likhiṣyanti[13] likhāpayiṣyanti[13] pustakalikhitaṃ vā[16] satkariṣyanti[17] nānāpuṣpamālyagandhavilepanacūrṇacīvaracchatradhvajapatākābhiḥ[18], [taiḥ][19] paṃcaraṃgikair[20] vastraiḥ[21] pariveṣṭayitvā[22] śucau pradeśe sthāpayitavyaṃ; tatra[23] catvāro mahārājānaḥ saparivārā anyāni[24] ca[25] devatākoṭīśatasahasrāṇy[26], [27] upasaṃhariṣyaṃti[28] [29)]yatredaṃ sūtraṃ pracariṣyati.[(29] yemam[30] sūtraṃ[31] dhārayiṣyanti[32] [33)]tasya bhagavato bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya nāmadheyam, pūrvapraṇidhānaviśeṣavistaraṃ ca[(33] na teṣām[34] akālamaraṇaṃ[35] bhaviṣyati, na ca[36] kenacic chakyam[37] ojopahartuṃ[38], hṛtaṃ vā ojaḥ punaḥ[39] pratyāharanti.[40]

1) V,X,Z: -śrī; T: for the whole of [13] the sequence of individual sentences and clauses is considerably different in T. 2) V: -aṃ. 3) X: paści. 4) V: omits ca; Z: obl. 5) V: omits; X,Z: obl., the space in both - certainly in Z - seems to require nānopāyai; both recto and verso of this folio in X, fol.21, is very difficult to read; T: rnam pa sna tshogs su. 6) V: omits sam-; X: obl., but space probably requires it; Z: sa-; T shows no prefix. 7) V,Z: antaśa; X: obl. 8) V: -gatanām; X: xxxpnāntaram; Z: -gatānāmṃ. 9) V: buddhānāṃ nāma; X: buddhaxāmakaṃ; Y: buddhānāma; Z: buddhānāmmaṃka(pu)xx. T: saṅs rgyas kyi mtshan. 10) V: -e nipatiṣyanti; X: obl.; Z: ...xxriṣyāmi; T: ñe bar bsgrag par bgyi'o. 11) V: ya imaṃ; Y: ye idaṃ, but cf. below,

yemam in exactly the same phrase; Z: yedam. 12)X: sūtraratnam; Z: sūtra-ratnan. 13)X: sing. 14)X: inserts paryax-ptamti. 15)V: parebhyaś ca. 16)V: pustakagatam(m); X: pustakagata(m) vā krtvā; Z: ...xxstakagatam; T: glegs bam la bris te. 17)X: samskarisyanti. 18)V,X: nānāpuspadhūpa-gandhamālyavilepanacchatradhvajapatākābhi; Z: nānāpuspa(dhūpa)gandha-māl(ya)xx... ...xx(cchatra)dh(v)ajapatākābhih; T: me tog dan / bdug pa dan / spos dan / phren ba dan / byug pa dan / gdugs dan / rgyal mtshan rnams kyis. 19)Y: omits taih. 20)X: -ramxikā; Z: from here about 41 aksaras missing; occasionally an aksara can be read. 21)V,X: vastrai. 22)V,X: parivestya; T: dkris te. 23)V: tatahś. 24)Y: anye. 25)X: cānekāni. 26)V: devakotīnayuta..tasahasrāni; X: devaxoxxyutaxxxhasrāni; Z: preserves only ...srān(i). 27)V,X: insert tatro; Z: tatroxx(?). 28)V: -opasam-kramisyamti; X: -opasamkramayisyati; Z: obl.; T: mchi bar 'gyur ro. 29)(29X: tatredam sūtra[m] praxxsy(īsi); T: gan na mdo sde 'di gnas pa der ... (mchi bar 'gyur ro). 30)V: te ca bhagavamn imam; X: te ca bhaga-vann[i]ma[m]. 31)V,X: sūtraratnam. 32)Y: dhārisyati; X: sg. 33)V: ..bhagato.. tathāgatasya; the single folio of V ends here. X: tasya bhagavato bhaisaj-yaguruvaidūryaprabhasya tathā[ga]tasya pūrvapranidhānaviśesavistaravi-bhagam tasya tathāgatasya nāmadheyam dhārayisyati; T: (gan dag) bcom ldan 'das de bžin gśegs pa sman gyi bla bai dū rya'i 'od de'i mtshan dan / snon gyi smon lam gyi khyad par rgyas pa'i mdo 'di dzin pa. T has connected the mdo of the first clause in Skt with the pūrvapranidhāna. 34)X: tasām na; Z: na [t]e[sām]. 35)X: kāla-. 36)X: cāsya. 37)X: chakya. 38)X: ojam ahātum; Z: ojopahati; T: 'phrog par. 39)X: punar api; Z: puhnah. 40)X: pratisamharati; Z: pratyāharatī. The whole of the second clause in Z is added in another hand below the line.

[14] 1)bhagavān āha: evam etad(1 mamjuśrī 2)tathā yathā vadasi.(2 ye3 ca mamjuśrī śrāddhāh4 kulaputrā5 vā kuladuhitaro6 vā tasya tathā-gatasya 7)pūjākartukāmā tais tasya tathāgatasya(7 pratimā8 kārāpayi-tavyā,8 saptarātrindivasam9 āryāstāmgasamanvāgatam10 upavāsam11 upa-vasitavyam,12 śucim13 āhāram14 krtvā,15 śucipradeśe16 nānāpuspāvakīrne17 nānāgandhanidhūpite18 nānāvastracchatradhvajapatākābhih19 samalamkrte20 prthivīpradeśe susnātagātrena śucivimalavasanadhārinā21 22)nirmala-cittenākalusacittenāvyāpādacittena bhavitavyam(22; vādyatūryasamgīti-sampravāditena23 sā tathāgatapratimā24 pradaksinīkartavyā25 26)tasya

tathāgatasya pūrvapraṇidhānaṃ manasikartavyam[(26 27)]idaṃ sūtraṃ prakāśayitavyam[(27]; yaṃ cintayaṃti[28] yaṃ[29] prārthayanti[30 31)]taṃ sarvābhiprāyam[(31] paripūrayanti[32]: yadi [33)]dīrghāyuṣkatāṃ prārthayanti dīrghāyuṣkā bhavanti[(33]$_{\alpha}$, yadi bhogān[34] prārthayanti[35]$_{\alpha}$ bhogasamṛddho bhavati[36]$_{\alpha}$, yady aiśvaryaṃ prārthayanty[37,38] alpakṛcchreṇa[39] labhanti[40]$_{\alpha}$, yadi putrābhilāṣiṇo[41] bhavanti[42] putralābhaṃ[43] pratilabhante[44]. ye pāpakaṃ svapnaṃ paśyanti[45 46)]yatra vāyasaḥ sthito bhavati$_{\alpha}$ durnimittaṃ vā paśyanti$_{\alpha}$ yatra sthāne śataṃ alakṣmīnāṃ upasthito bhavati[(46]$_{\alpha}$, te[47] tasya bhagavato bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya [48)]nānāprakāreṇa pūjābhisaṃskāraṃ kurvanti[(48 49)]sarvaduḥsvapnadurnimittaṃ cāmaṃgalabhāvā na paśyanti[(49]$_{\alpha}$. [50)]yeṣāṃ agnibhayaṃ udakabhayaṃ caṇḍahastibhayaṃ siṃhavyāghrabhayaṃ ikṣatarakṣāśīviṣavṛścikaśatapādabhayaṃ[(50] tais[51] tasya tathāgatasya pūjā kartavyā, sarvebhyo bhayebhyaḥ[52] parimokṣyanti[53]$_{\alpha}$; yeṣāṃ[54] paracakrabhayaṃ corabhayaṃ taskarabhayaṃ tais[55] tasya tathāgatasya pūjā kartavyā[56]$_{\infty}$.

1)(1 X: bhagavāṃn āhaivam eta. 2)(2 X: evam eta tadyathā vadasi. 3) X: yas. In all Mss there is a good deal of confusion of number throughout this whole paragraph. I have generally preferred to read pl. 4) Z: śrāddhā. 5) X,Y,Z: -putro. 6) X,Y: -duhitā; Z: obl. 7)(7 X: pūjākartukāmenas tena tasya tathāgatasya; Y: omits; this omission is similar to, and to be accounted for in the same way, as those noted at 5.13 n.2, 6 n.11; T: (dad pa'i rigs kyi bu 'am / rigs kyi bu mo gaṅ dag) de bźin gśegs pa de la mchod pa byed pa de dag gis ... 8) X: -āṃ, 9) X: saptarātriṃdivaṃ saptaṃ; Z: saptarātṛ.ṃdivasa; T: ñin źag bdun du. 10) X: āryāṣṭāṃgo·mārgasamanvāgatom; Y: āryāṣṭāṃgasamanvāgatahm; Z: āryāṣṭāgasamanvāgatam; T: in reference to the presence or absence of the mārga read by X, but rejected by Y,Z, the evidence of T is very interesting: N and L of *Bhg* read 'phags pa'i lam yan (N: lan) lag brgyad, and so does N of *StP*; all other versions follow Skt. Y and Z. 11) Z: upavāsam was originally omitted and has been written underneath the line by another hand. 12) X: upavasitavaṃ; Y,Z: -itavyaḥ. 13) X: [śu]cina śucim. 14) X: ahāra. 15) X: bhojanaṃ; Z: bhuktvā; T: bza' źiṅ. 16) X,Z: śucai pradeśe (Z originally read praveśe, but the correction -de- was added by another hand below the line). 17) X: omits; Z: -puṣpābhikīrṇe;

T: 'me tog sna tshogs sil ma bkram pa. [18] X: -gandhānidhūpite, Z: -gandhapradhūpite. [19] X: -patākā(samalaṃkṛte); Z: -patākābhi. [20] X: inserts sā. [21] Z: -vasa-; again the sequence of the clauses here differs somewhat in T. [22)(22] X: nirmalacitenākaluṣacitena sarvasatveṣu maitracitena sarvasatvānām antike samacitena bhavitavyaṃ; Z: nirmalacittenākaluṣacittena āvyāpādacittena maitracittena sarvasatveṣu hitacittena bhavitavyaṃ karuṇācittena muditācittena upekṣācitena samacittena bhavitavyaṃ; T: dri ma med pa'i sems daṅ / rñog pa med pa'i sems daṅ / gnod sems med pa'i sems daṅ / byams pa'i sems daṅ / btaṅ sñoms kyi sems daṅ / mñam pa'i sems su bya / [23] X: nānātūryasaṃgītipravāditena. [24] X: -pratimāṃ; Z: tathāgataśarīrapratimāṃ. [25] Y: pradakṣiṇaṃ kartavya; Z:-kartavyāḥ. [26)(26] X: ... -praṇidhānāni manasikartavyāni; Y ... praṇidhāna manasi-; Z: tasya pū praṇidhānaṃ..; T: de'i sṅon gyi smon lam yaṅ yid la bya źiṅ. [27)(27] X: idaṃ ca sūtraṃ pravartayitavyāṃ; Y: ... -yitavya; Z: omits the whole phrase. T: mdo sde 'di yaṅ bstan na. [28] X: citayati; Y: cintayati. [29] Y: yat; Z: om. [30] X,Y,Z, sing. [31)(31] X: sarvābhiprāya; Y: tatsarvābhiprāyaṃ. [32] X,Y,Z: sing. [33)(33] X: dīrghāyuṣko bhavati only; an omission of a typical kind, cf. 5.13 n.2, 6 n.11, etc.; Y,Z: both vbs. sing. [34] X,Z: bhogaṃ. [35] Y,Z: sing. [36] X: obl.; T: (for the whole clause) gal te loṅs spyod daṅ ldan par smon na ni loṅs spyod 'byor par 'gyur ro). [37] X: abhiprāhrthayati; Z: abhiprārthayati. [38] Z: inserts: tad. [39] X: alpakṛcchena [40] X: prāpnoti; Y: labhati; Z: labhavati; T (for the whole clause): gal te dbaṅ phyug daṅ ldan par smon na ni tshegs chuṅ ṅus rñed par 'gyur ro /. [41] X: putrābhilābhī; Y,Z: -lāṣī. [42] X,Y,Z: sing. [43] X: putrapratilābhaṃ; Z: putra; T: bu rñed par 'gyur ro. [44] X,Y,Z: sing. [45] X,Y: sing.; Z: originally read śyanti, but another hand has inserted pa- below the line; T: gaṅ dag sdig pa can gyi rmi lam rmis sam /. [46)(46] X: yatra vāya st[h]ita bhavati drunimitaṃ vā sthitaṃ bhavati; Y: yatra tatra vā sthitā bhavati durnimittaṃ paśyaṃti yatra sthāne śatam alakṣmīṇām upasthito bhavati; Z: yaxxxxxxxti durnimittaṃ vā paśya-xxx... one folio of Z is here missing; T: gaṅ dag sdig pa can gyi rmi lam rmis sam / gaṅ du bya khva ta daṅ / ltas ṅan pa mthoṅ ṅam / gnas gaṅ du bkra mi śis pa brgya dag gnas par gyur pa la. I have 'corrected' Y's tatra vā to vāyasaḥ on the basis of T, but the reading for the whole clause remains provisional. [47] X: tais; Y: ye; T: gaṅ dag. Though the reading of Y and T is unmistakable, the sense here seems to require a correlative to the ye which begins the sentence and I have corrected accordingly. [48)(48] X: pūjā kartavāṃ; T: mchod pa rnam pa sna tshogs kyis bkur sti byed na /. [49)(49] X: sarvaduṣvapnadurnimitāmaṃṅgalyāś ca bhāvā praśamiṣyati; T: rmi lam ṅan pa daṅ / ltas ṅan pa daṅ /

bkra mi śis pa'i dṅos po thams cad mthoṅ bar mi 'gyur ro / [50)(50]X: yasām agnyamudakaviṣaśastrapradāta·caṃṇḍahastisiṃgha·vyāghrarikṣatarakṣa-dvīpikā-āśīviṣavṛścikaśatapādadaṃśamaśakādhibhayaṃ na bhavati; T: gaṅ dag mes 'jigs pa daṅ / chus 'jigs pa daṅ / mtshon gyis 'jigs pa daṅ / dug gis 'jigs pa daṅ / g-yaṅ sas 'jigs pa daṅ / glaṅ po che gtum pos 'jigs pa daṅ / seṅ ges 'jigs pa daṅ / stag gis 'jigs pa daṅ / dom daṅ / dred daṅ / sbrul gdug pas 'jigs pa daṅ / sbrul daṅ/sdig pa daṅ / rkaṅ lag brgya pas 'jigs pa. [51)]X: tena; T: de dag gis. [52)]X: xxxxbhya [= sarvabhayebhya ?]; T: 'jigs pa thams cad las. [53)]X: sing. [54)]Y: teṣām; T: gaṅ dag. [55)]X: tais tais. [56)]X: karaṇīyā.

[15] punar aparaṃ maṃjuśrī ye[1] śrāddhāḥ[2] kulaputrā[3] vā kuladuhitaro[4] vā yāvajjīvaṃ triśaraṇam[5] udgṛhṇanti[6][α] ananyadevatā[7], ye paṃca śikṣā-padāni dhārayanti[8][α], [9)]ye daśa śikṣāpadāni dhārayanti[(9][α], ye[10] bodhi-satvasaṃvaraṃ caturthaṃ śataṃ[11] śikṣāpadānāṃ[12] dhārayanti[13][α]; ye punar[14] niṣkrāntagṛhāvasā[15] bhikṣavaḥ[16] dviśatapaṃcāśa śikṣāpadāni[17] dhāra-yanti[18][α], yā[19] bhikṣuṇyaḥ[20] paṃcaśataśikṣāpadāni[21] dhārayanti[22]; ye[23] [24)]yathā-parigṛhītāḥ śikṣāsaṃvarā tato 'nyatarānyatara-śikṣāpada--bhraṣṭā bhavanti[(24][α],[25] durgatyapāyabhayabhītā[26], ye[27] tasya bhaga-vato bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya [28)]namasyanti pūjāṃ kurvanti,[(28] [29)] [30)]na teṣāṃ tryapāyaduḥkhaṃ pratikāṃkṣitavyaṃ[(30]. yaḥ kaści[31] mātṛgrāmaḥ[32] prasavanakāle[33] [34)]atīvatīvrāṃ duḥkhāṃ[(34], [35] vedanāṃ vedayati, yas[36] tasya bhagavato bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya [37)]namasyati pūjā ca kurvati[(37],[38] [(29] śīghraṃ[39] pari-mucyati[40][α], sarvāṃgaparipūrṇaṃ putraṃ janayiṣyaty[41] abhirūpaḥ[42] prāsā-diko[43] darśanīyaḥ[44] tīkṣṇendriyo[45] buddhimān[46] nirogo[47] 'lpāvādho[48], na tasya[49] śakyam[50] [51)]amānuṣeṇa ojo grahītum[(51]

[1)] Y: omits; T: gaṅ dag. [2)] X: śrāddhā; Y: śrāddhaḥ. [3)] X: -putro. [4)] Y: -duhitā. [5)] X,Y: tr-. [6)] X: sing. [7)] X: inserts bhavati; T: / lha gźan mi 'dzin pa daṅ /. [8)] X: sing.; Śikṣ 17.1 begins with ye pañca. [9)(9] X: omits the whole phrase. [10)] Śikṣ: inserts ca. [11)] X: caturuttaraṃ śikṣāpadaṃ śataṃ. [12)] X: see n.11. [13)] X: sing. [14)] X: punar api; Y: punaḥ; Śikṣ: punar (abhi-). [15)] Śikṣ: abhiniṣkrānta-. [16)] X: bhibhikṣava. [17)] X: paṃ-

cādhikai dvi śikṣāpadaśatair; Śikṣ: pañcāśādhike dve śikṣāpadaśate; the formation of Y is unusual. 18)X: sing. 19)So X; Y: ye; Śikṣ: yāś ca. 20)X: bhikṣuṇyā. 21)X: paṃcaśikṣāpadaśatāni; Śikṣ: pañcaśikṣāpadaśatāni. 22)X: sing. 23)X,Śikṣ: insert ca. 24)(24X: yathāparigṛhītā śikṣāsaṃvarād anyatarā śikṣāpadā bhraṣṭā bhavati; Z: fol.17a begins here: ...xxpadāsaṃvarā tato 'nyatarānyatarācchikṣāpadād bhraṣṭā bhavanti; Śikṣ: yathāparigṛhītāc chikṣāsaṃvarād anyatarāc chikṣāpadād bhraṣṭā bhavanti; T: gaṅ dag ji ltar yoṅs su bzuṅ ba'i bslab pa'i sdom pa de dag gi naṅ nas bslab pa'i gźi gaṅ yaṅ ruṅ ba źig las ñams par gyur te /. 25)X: sacā te; Z: te; Śikṣ: sacet te; T: ... gaṅ dag ... na. 26)X,Śikṣ: durgatibhayabhītās; Z: durgati-apāyabhītā; T: ṅan 'gro ṅan soṅ gis 'jigs skrag pa. 27)X,Śikṣ: omit ye. 28)(28X: nāmadheyam dhārayeyur; Z: pūjāṃ kurvanti; Śikṣ: nāmadheyaṃ dhārayeyur yathāvibhavataś ca pūjāṃ kuryuḥ; T: mchod pa rnam pa sna tshogs byed na. 29)(29This entire passage is omitted in Y through an omission of the usual kind; cf. 5.13 n.2, 6 n.11, etc. 30)(30X: na bhūhyaxxxxrūpāyagamanaṃ pratikāṃkṣitavyaṃ; Śikṣ: na bhūyas teṣāṃ apāyagatiḥ pratikāṅkṣitavyā; the quotation in Śikṣ of [15] ends here; T: de dag la ṅan soṅ gsum gyi sdug bsṅal med par śes par bya'o /. 31)X: yaś ca; Z: kaści; T: gaṅ la la bu. 32)X: -grāma. 33)Z: prasamana-. 34)(34X: tīvrāṃ duḥkhaṃ kharāṃ kaṭṭukāṃ; T: sdug bsṅal ma ruṅs pa drag po mi bzad pa, agreeing with X. 35)Z: inserts te. 36)Z: ye. 37)(37X: nāmadheyam anusmare pūjā ca kuryu; Z: both vbs.pl.; T: mchod na. 38)X: inserts sa; Z: te; T: de. 39)X: sukhaṃ ca; Z: śīlaṃ; T: myur du. 40)X: prasvayate; Y,Z: pl.; T: yoṅs su thar bar 'gyur ro. 41)Y: pl.; X,Z: -ati abhi-. 42)X,Z: abhirūpa; Y: abhirūpaṃ. 43)X: prāsādika. 44)X: darśanīya. 45)X: -endriyam. 46)X: budhimantaṃ. 47)X: ārogyaṃ. 48)X: alpāvādhaṃ bhaviṣyati; Y: 'lpāvādhaḥ; Z: ...xx-o. 49)X: ca instead of tasya. 50)X: śakyate. 51)(51X: -mojo grahartum, omitting amānuṣena; Y: (śakyam)āmantrayati sma; thus omitting by a simple scribal error: ojo grahītum. atha khalu bhagavān āyuṣmantam ānandam, i.e. the introductory phrase of [16]; Z: amānuṣā ojo grxtum; T: de la mi ma yin pas mdaṅs 'phrog par mi nus so /.

[16][1] atha khalu[2] bhagavān āyuṣmantam ānandam āmantrayati[3] sma: śraddhāsyasi[4] tvam ānanda pattīyiṣyasi[5] yad aham[6] tasya bhagavato bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya-[7)]arhataḥ samyaksaṃbuddhasya[(7] guṇānuśaṃsān[8] varṇayiṣyāmi[9], atha vā te kāṃkṣā[10] vimatir vicikitsā vā[11] atra gambhīre buddhagocare. athāyuṣmān ānando[12] bhagavantam

etad avocat: na me [13)]bhadanta bhagavan[(13] kāṃkṣā[14] na[15] vimati na[16] vicikitsā vā tathāgatabhāṣiteṣu dharmeṣu[17][α]. tatkasya hetor[18]. nāsti tathāgatānām apariśuddhakāyavāṅmanaḥsamudācāraḥ[19]. imau[20] bhagavaṃ[21] sūryācandramasau[22] evaṃ maharddhikāv[23] evaṃ mahānubhāvau[24] pṛthivyāṃ[25] nipateyuḥ[26]; sumeruḥ[27] parvatarājā[28] sthānāt[29] saṃkramet[30] na tv eva[31] buddhānāṃ vacanam[32] anyathā[33] bhavati[34][α]. kiṃ tu[35] bhadanta[36] bhagavan[37] santi satvā[38] śrāddhendriyavikalā idam[39] buddhagocaraṃ śrutvā[40] teṣāṃ[41] evam[42] bhavati[43][α]: katham idam[44] [45)]nāmadheyasmaraṇamātreṇa[(45] tasya tathāgatasya ettakā[46] guṇānuśaṃsā bhavanti[47][α]; te na śraddadhanti[48] na pattīyanti[49] pratikṣipanti[α], teṣāṃ dīrgharātram [50)]anarthāyāhitāyāsukhāya vinipātāya[(50] bhaviṣyati[α]. bhagavān āha[α]: asthānam ānandānavakāśo[51] [52)]yeṣāṃ tasya tathāgatasya nāmadheyaṃ karṇapuṭe nipateta[(52] yat tasya[53] durgatyapāyagamanaṃ[54] bhavet[55]. duḥśraddadhānīyam[56] ānanda buddhānāṃ buddhagocaram. yat[57] tvaṃ ānanda śraddadhāsi[58] pattīyasi[59] tathāgatasyaiṣo[60] 'nubhāvo[61] draṣṭavya[62]; abhūmiś cātra[63] sarvaśrāvakapratyekabuddhānāṃ sthāpayitvā[64] ekajātipratibaddhā[65] bodhisatvā mahāsatvā.[66,67] durlabha[68] ānanda manuṣyapratilābhaḥ[69]; durlabhaṃ triṣu[70] ratneṣu śraddhāgauravaṃ; durlabhataraṃ ca[71] tasya tathāgatasya [72)]nāmadheyaśravaṇam[73]. apramāṇam ānanda tasya bhagavato bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya[(72] bodhisatvacaryam[74], apramāṇam upāyakauśalyam, apramāṇam[75] praṇidhānavistaram[76]. ākāṃkṣamāṇo 'haṃ tasya tathāgatasya [77)]kalpena vā kalpāvaśeṣeṇa vā[(77] [78)]bodhisatvacārikā vistareṇa saṃprakāśayeyam[(78] kṣīyetānanda kalpam[79] na tv eva [śakyaṃ][80] tasya bhagavato bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya pūrvapraṇidhānaviśeṣavistarasya[81] paryanto[82] 'dhigantum[ω].

[1)]Śikṣ 174.7 begins here. [2)]Śikṣ: omits. [3)]X: āmaṃntraya; Śikṣ: āmantrayate. [4)]X: śraddhāsi; Z: śraddhasyasi; Śikṣ: śraddadhāsi. [5)]X: obl.; Śikṣ: pattīyasi. [6)]Z: aham. [7)(7]X,Śikṣ,T all omit arhataḥ samyaksaṃbuddhasya. T has here once again changed the sequence of clauses. [8)]X,Śikṣ, T all omit -ānuśaṃsān and have simply: guṇān, yon tan; Z: guṇānuśaṃsā.

9) X: varṇayiṣyāmx; Z: -ayiṣyāmaḥ; Śikṣ: varṇayāmi. 10) Y: kākṣā. 11) T: yid gñis sam / som ñi 'am / the tshom za ba med dam /. 12) X: ānandam. 13)(13 X: omits bhadanta bhagavan and has instead atra. 14) X: kākṣā. 15) Z, Śikṣ, T: vā. 16) X, Z, Śikṣ, T: vimatir vā. 17) X, Z, Śikṣ: have sūtrānteṣu instead of dharmeṣu; T: chos rnams la. 18) Z, Śikṣ: hetoh. 19) X: -kāyavāṅmanasamudācāratā; Śikṣ: -kāyavāṅmanaḥsamudācāratā. 20) X, Z: ime. 21) X, Z: bhagavāṃ. 22) X: -ś candrasūryam; Y: -masauv; Z: sūrya-; Śikṣ: candrasūryāv; T: gdugs daṅ dguṅ zla. 23) X: mahardhikām; Y: mahardhikāv; Z: mahardhikau. 24) X: mahānubhāvā. 25) Z: pṛthivyā. 26) X: prapateta; Śikṣ: patetāṃ; T: ltuṅ yaṅ gda'. 27) X: sumeru vā; Y: sumeru. 28) X, Z: -rāja. 29) X, Y: sthānā; T: gnas nas. 30) X: calen; Y: saṃkramena; Z: saṃkrame; Śikṣ: calet; T: 'pho yaṅ gda'i. 31) X, Śikṣ, T: omit eva. 32) X: vacanan; Y, Z: vacanamm. 33) T: gźan du which may be either anyathā or anyatra. 34) X: bhaveyu; Z: bhave; Śikṣ: bhavet; T: 'gyur lags so. 35) Y, Z: kintu. 36) X: omits. 37) X: bhagava; Z: bhagavaṃ. 38) Śikṣ: satvāh. 39) Śikṣ has ye in place of idaṃ. 40) Śikṣ: inserts na śraddadhati. 41) X: omits. 42) Y: eva. 43) X: vakṣyanti; Z: bhavanti; T: 'di sñam du sems par 'gyur te /. 44) X: eta; Y: ida. 45)(45 X; nāmadheyam anusmaraṇamātrex; Śikṣ: nāmadheyaṃ smaraṇamātreṇa; T: mtshan 'di dran pa tsam gyis. 46) X: has tāvanto in place of ettakā; Y: -gatasyettakā; T: śin tu. 47) X: obl.; Z: bhaviṣyanti; Śikṣ: bhavati; 'gyur (sñam nas). 48) X: xddhadadanti. 49) X: patīyanti. 50)(50 X: xrthāya na hitāya na sukhāya vinipātāya; Y, Z: anarthāyahitāyasukhāyavinipātāya; T: gnod pa daṅ / mi sman pa daṅ / mi bde ba daṅ / log par ltuṅ bar 'gyur ro /; Śikṣ has the reading we have adopted here. 51) X: aḥsthānam ānandā-; Z: asthānam ānandam anavakāśaḥ; cf. T which again rearranges the order of the clauses. 52)(52 X: yenas tasya tathāgatasya nāmadheyaṃ śrutaṃ; Y: ...nipatita, Z: yeṣān ...; Śikṣ: yeṣāṃ tasya nāmadheyaṃ nipatet karṇe; T: de bźin gśegs pa de'i mtshan su'i rna lam du grag par gyur pa. 53) X: ya tasya satvasya; Śikṣ: teṣāṃ. 54) X: durgatigamanam; Z: durgati atiapāyagamanaṃ; T: ṅan 'gro ṅan soṅ du 'gro bar 'gyur ba. 55) X: bhaven nedam sthānam (vidyate); Śikṣ: bhaved iti. 56) X: (du)śraddhadhānīyam; Y: duśraddadhanīyam; Śikṣ: duḥśraddhānīyaś cā-. 57) X: yada; Y: ya; Z: yaś ca; Śikṣ: yac ca. 58) X: śrāddhāsi; Z: śraddhāsi. 59) X: patīyasi. 60) X: -tasyeṣo; Z: -tasyaisam. 61) Z: anu-. 62) Z: draṣṭavyom; Śikṣ: -tavyaḥ. 63) X: abhūmir atra. 64) X: sthāpayetva(ika-). 65) X: -aikajātilabdhā. 66) On these acc.s in -ā see Introduction. 67) Śikṣ quotation ends here. 68) X: durlabham; Y: durlabhā-. 69) T: mir 'gyur ba rñed pa ni rñed par dka'o. 70) X: obl.; Z: tṛṣu. 71) X: durl(abhataraś ca); Y: -taraś ca; Z: -tarasya. 72)(72 X: omits this entire piece. 73) Y: nāmadheyam śravaṇaṃ.

[74)]X: -caryā(ṇ)x; Z: -caryaṃ a-. [75)]X: apramāṇa. [76)]Z: -vistara; T: smon lam gyi khyad par rgyas pa yaṅ tshad med do /. [77)(77]X,Z: kalpaṃ vā kalpāvaśeṣaṃ vā. [78)(78]X: bodhisatvacārikāyā vistaravibhaṅgaṃ nirdeśeyaṃ; Z: bodhisatvacārikāṃ; T: ṅa ... bskal pa 'am / bskal pa las lhag par rgya cher yaṅ dag par bśad par 'dod. [79)]Y: kalpa. [80)]None of our Mss - and we have three here - has śakyaṃ, but all unmistakably have the infinitive adhigantuṃ at the end of the sentence. T also has no śakyaṃ, but it, at least, also does not construct the main vb. as an infin. In light of the requirements of sense, and in light of parallel passages (Sukh. 37.4, etc.) we have supplied the śakyaṃ. [81)]X: -vistaram; T: rgyas pa'i. [82)]X: omits; Z: vistaraparyantam.

[17] tena ca[1] punaḥ[2] samayena[3] [4)]tasminn eva parṣadi[(4] trāṇamukto nāma bodhisatvo mahāsatvaḥ[5]; sa utthāyāsanād[6] [7)]ekāṃsaṃ cīvaraṃ prāvṛtya[(7] dakṣiṇaṃ jānumaṇḍalaṃ pṛthivyāṃ pratiṣṭhāpya yena bhagavāṃs tenāṃjaliṃ praṇamya bhagavantam etad avocat: bhaviṣyanti bhadanta[8] bhagavan[9] paścime kāle paścime[10] samaye satvā[11] nānāvyādhiparipīḍitā, dīrghaglānyena[12] kṣīṇagātrā[13], kṣuttarṣocchuṣkakaṇṭhauṣṭhā[14], maraṇābhimukhā[15], rodamānai[16] mitrajñātisālohitai[17] parivāritā[18], [19)]andhakārān diśaḥ paśyanto[(19] yamapuruṣair apakarṣamāṇā[20]; tasya[21] kaḍevaraṃ atra[22] śayitam[23], vijñānaṃ yamasya dharmarājasyāgrata-m-upanīyati[24]; yā ca[25] tasya [26)]puruṣasya sahajā pṛṣṭ[h]ānubaddhā devatā, yat tena kuśalaṃ vā akuśalaṃ vā kṛtaṃ bhavet[(26 27)]tac ca sulikhitaṃ kṛtvā[(27], yamasya dharmarājasyopanāmyate[28]; [29] yamo[30] dharmarājas[31] taṃ pṛcchati gaṇayati, yathākṛtaṃ[32,33] kuśalaṃ akuśalaṃ vā[34] [35)]tathājñāṃ ājñāpayati[(35]; [36)]ye tasya bhagavato bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya śaraṇaṃ gamiṣyanti tasyāturasyārthāyedṛśena prayogena pūjāṃ kurvanti[(36]. sthānam etad vidyate[37] yat[38] tasya vijñānaṃ[39] punar eva[40] pratinivarteta[41] [42)]svapnāntara ivātmānaṃ saṃjānāti[(42] yadi vā saptame divase, yadi vaikaviṃśatime divase, yadi vā paṃcatriṃśatime[43] divase, yadi vā navacatvāriṃśatime[44] divase tasya vijñānaṃ[45] nivarteta, smṛtiṃ upalabhet[46]; so[47] kuśalaṃ[48] akuśalaṃ[49] karmavipākaṃ svayam eva pratyakṣo bhavati[50]; [51] jīvitahetor[52] [53)]api pāpaṃ karma

na karoti(53 tasmāc[54] chrāddhena kulaputreṇa vā kuladuhitā vā tasya [55]) tathāgatasya pūjā kartavyāh(55.

[1]) X: khalu instead of ca. [2]) X: puna. [3]) X: samaye. [4])(4 X: tasyām eva parṣadi; Z: tatra pariṣāyāṃ; T: 'khor de'i naṅ nas. [5]) X: mahāsatva sannipatito bhūt ṣannisaṇṇaḥ; X alone makes this addition which is a piece of later stereotyped phraseology. [6]) X: usthāyā-; Z: -āsanāṃd. [7])(7 X: ekāṃsam utarāṃsaṃgaṃ kṛtvā; Z: ... prāvaritvā; T: bla gos phrag pa gcig tu gzar nas. X again has a reading conforming to later stereotyped phraseology. [8]) X: omits bhadanta. [9]) X: although partially obliterated, X appears to have here inserted satvā; cf. n.11; Z: bhagavaṃ. [10]) Z: pamo. [11]) X: omits satvā; cf. n.9. [12]) X: dīrghavyādhinā; T: (bro nad sna tshogs kyis yoṅs su gzir te /) yun riṅ po'i bro nad kyis. [13]) Y: -gātra. [14]) X: acukṣata-śuṣka-kaṇṭhoṣṭā; Y: kṣutarṣocchuṣkakaṇṭhoṣtha; Z: kṣutarṣocchuṣkakaṇṭhauṣṭa; T: bkres pa daṅ / skom pas gre ba daṅ / mchu ni skams /. [15]) Y: -ābhimukha. [16]) X: rodamānebhi; Z: redamānābhi. [17]) X: nirmitāmānyajñātisalohitai. Z: mitrajñātisālohitebhi; T: mdza' bśes daṅ / ñe du daṅ / snag gi gñen mtshams .. : kyis. [18]) Z: paritā. [19])(19 X: amndhākārān diśamapaśyato; Y: -āndhākārā diśamapaśyanto; Z: andhākāradiśāsapaśyantoḥ; T: phyogs rnams ni mun par mthoṅ /. All three Mss. insist on a final long a for andha, an apparent acc.sing. of diś, and the neg. prefix a- for paśyanto; in light of this our emendation is a radical one. It is not impossible that andhākāra- represents a case of double sandhi and that we should read andhā ākārān diśam apaśyanto. T could easily have made the mistake that we perhaps make in our emendation. [20]) X: ākarṣamāṇai; Z: vākarṣayamāṇāḥ; T: (gśin rje'i mi rnams kyis ni) draṅs te. [21]) X: so ca tasya; Z: so tasya. [22]) X: kakaḍevaremam atra; Z: after atra about 15 akṣaras missing; T: de'i lus 'di na ñal. [23]) X: śayita. [24]) Z: upanāmayati; T: khrid ciṅ. We have taken the -m of -āgratam (= agratas) as intended for a hiatus-bridger(?) [25]) X: yaś ca; Y: yac ca; Z: -śca; T; see next note. [26])(26 X: satvasva sahajānuvaddhā devatā syā yatkiṃci tena puruṣeṇa kuśalam akuśalaṃ bā kṛtaṃ bhavati; Z: manuṣyaxx ... (about 13 akṣaras) ...xxkuśalamūlaṃ vā akuśalamūlaṃ vā kṛtaṃxx... (about 11 akṣaras); T: mi de daṅ lhan cig skyes pa'i lha slad bźin 'braṅ ba gaṅ lags pa des ni des dge ba daṅ / mi dge ba bgyis pa. [27])(27 X: ta sarvaṃ sulikhitaṃ kṛtv-; T: de thams cad legs par yi ger bris nas. [28]) X: -opaxmyate; Z: -opanāmayati; T: phul ba daṅ /. [29]) X: inserts tadā. [30]) X: inserts 'pi. [31]) Y: -rājās; Z: -rājāxx... (about 4 akṣaras). [32]) Y: -kṛta. [33]) X: inserts cāsya. [34]) Z: omits akuśalam vā.

[35)(35] Z: tathājñāpayati; T: (dge ba 'am / mi dge ba ji ltar bgyis pa) de bźin du bsgo ba las /. [36)(36] X: tatra xx te mitrajñātisālohitāsās tasya turasyārthāya taṃ bhagav(x)x bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabhaṃ tathāgataṃ śaraṇaṃ gaccheyus tasya tathāgatasya pūjāṃ kuryu; Z: ye tasya bhagavato xxxxruv(ai)ḍūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya śaraṇaṃ gamiṣyati · tena tasyāturasyāxxxśena prayogena pūjā kartavyā; T: gaṅ dag nad pa de'i don du bcom ldan 'das de bźin gśegs pa sman gyi bla bai ḍū rya'i 'od de la skyabs su mchi źiṅ 'di 'dra ba'i sbyor bas mchod pa bgyid na /. [37)] Z: sthānam etac chidyate. [38)] X: ya; Z: yadi. [39)] X: tadvijñānaṃ; Z: vijñāna. [40)] X: api instead of eva. [41)] X: pratinivartata. [42)(42] X: svapnāṃntaragata ivātmānaṃ saṃjānīte; Y: svapnāntarevam ātmānaṃ saṃjānāti; Z: svapnāntaragata ivātmānaṃ saṃjānāti; T: rmi lam rmis pa bźin du bdag ñid kyis 'tshal ba'i gnas der mchis te /. [43)] X: paṃcatrīśatime; Z: paṃcatrṃśatime. [44)] X: ekonapaṃcāśatime. [45)] X: inserts punar api; T: slar ldog ciṅ. [46)] X: upalabheta; Z: upalabhati; T: (dran pa) rñed la. [47)] X: sa. [48)] X: kuśalām. [49)] X: inserts vā; Z: akulaṃ. [50)] T (for the whole phrase): de dge ba daṅ / mi dge ba'i las kyi rnam par smin ba bdag ñid kyi mṅon sum du 'gyur te. [51)] X: inserts: jātvā sa. [52)] Y: -hetur. [53)(53] X: xxx pi pāpam akuxxk(arma na x)rasyati. [54)] Z: tasmā (śrā-). [55)(55] X: bhagavato bhaiṣajyaguruxxryaprabhasya tathāgatasya nāmadheyaṃ dhārayetavyaṃ · yathā saṃvidyamānā ca pūjāṃ kartavyā; Z: (śrāxx...) (about 15 or 16 akṣaras) ... xxgatasya pūjā kartavyāḥ (judging by the number of akṣaras, Z probably had the same reading as Y); T: de lta lags pas dad pa'i rigs kyi bu 'am / rigs kyi bu mos de bźin gśegs pa de la mchod par bgyi'o.

[18] athāyuṣmān ānandas trāṇamuktasya[1] bodhisatvasyaivam āha[2]$_{\alpha}$: katham kulaputra tasya bhagavato bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūrya[3]prabhasya tathāgatasya pūjā kartavyā$_{\alpha}$ trāṇamukto bodhisatva āha$_{\alpha}$ ye bhadantānanda[4] [5)]mahato vyādhe[(5] parimocitukāmā$_{\alpha}$, tais[6] tasyāturasyārthāya[7] sapta rātriṃdivasam[8] aṣṭāṃgasamanvāgatam[9] upoṣadhasaṃvaraṃ[10] gṛhītavyaṃ[11], bhikṣusaṃghasya cāhārapānai sarvopakaraṇair yathāśaktyā pūjopasthānaṃ kartavyaṃ; [12)]triṣkṛtvā rātrau triṣkṛtvā divase tasya bhagavato bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya namasyitavyaṃ[(12], navacatvāriṃśadvāredaṃ[13] sūtram [an]usmārayitavyaṃ[14] navacatvāriṃśad[15] dīpāḥ[16] pradīpitavyāḥ[17], sapta pratimā

kartavyāḥ, [18)]ekaikāyā pratimāyāḥ sapta sapta dīpāḥ sthāpayitavyāḥ[(18], ekameko[19] dīpaḥ[20] śakaṭacakrapramāṇaḥ[21] kartavyaḥ[22]. yadi[23] navacatvāriṃśatime[24] divase āloko na kṣīyate[25], [26)]paṃcaraṃgikāś ca patākā navacatvāriṃśad dṛṣṭikā(?) kartavyāḥ[(26].

[1)]X: trāṇamuktaṃ nāma. [2)]X: bodhisatvamm etad avocat; T: byaṅ chub sems dpa' skyabs grol la 'di skad ces smras so. [3)]X: -guruvaiḍū(rya)xx.. (1 leaf missing). [4)]X: bhagavatānanda. [5)(5]X: vyādhitaṃ mahato vyādhe; Y: mahanto vyādhayaḥ: T: gaṅ dag nad chen po las. [6)]Y: te; T: de dag gis. [7)]X: tasyaturasyā-. [8)]X: sapta divasāny; T: ñin bdun mtshan bdun du (cf. the edition of the Tib text [18]n.4 for the variants for this passage). [9)]X: āryāṣṭāṃga-. [10)]X: upavāsa(m). [11)]X: (u)pavasitavya. [12)]X: ca bhaga(vato) bhaiṣajyaguru[vaiḍūrya]prabhas tathāga tṛṣkṛitvā rātrau tṛṣkṛtvā divasau namaska[rtavyaṃ]; Y: triṣkritvā rātrau divasasya tasya ... (cf. Śikṣ 290.10: triṣkṛtvā rātrau triṣkṛtvā divase); T: ñin lan gsum mtshan lan gsum du/bcom ldan 'das de bžin gśegs pa sman gyi bla bai ḍū rya'i 'od de'i mtshan yid la bya'o. [13)]X: nacatvāriṃśatadvaredaṃ. [14)]X,Y: usmārayitavyaṃ; T: gdon par bya'o. [15)]X: ekonapaṃcāśa. [16)]X,Y: dīpā. [17)]X: prajvālayitavyā; T: bud par bya'o. [18)(18]X: ekaikayā pratimayā sapta dīpā prajvālayitavyā; T: sku gzugs re re'i spyan sṅar yaṅ mar me bdun bdun gžag go /. [19)]X: ekaiko. [20)]X: dīpa. [21)]X: śakaṭṭacakra-pramāṇa; Y: -pramāṇaṃ. [22)]X: kartavyā; Y: kartavyaṃ. [23)]X: yady. [24)]X: ekonaxxx.... [25)]T (for the whole clause): ci nas kyaṅ žag bži bcu rtsa dgur mar me mi zad par bya'o. [26)(26]X: veditavyāṃ sarvasampad iti paṃcaraṃgikāś ca patākā ekonapaṃ(caṃ)xkta kartavyā; Y: ... -catvāriṃśaḥ dṛṣṭikā; T: tshon sna lṅa pa'i ba dan bži bcu rtsa dgu las lhag par bya'o /.

[19] punar aparaṃ bhadantānanda[1] ye rājñāṃ[2] kṣatriyāṇāṃ[3] mūrdhābhiṣiktānāṃ[4] upadravopasargopāyāsāḥ[5] pratyupasthitā[6] bhaveyuḥ, vyādhipīḍā vā svacakraparacakrapīḍā[7] vā [8)]nakṣatrapīḍā vā nakṣatragrahapīḍā vākālena vātavṛṣṭipīḍā vā anāvṛṣṭipīḍā vā[(8], tena rājñā[9] kṣatriyeṇa[10] mūrdhābhiṣiktena sarvasatveṣu maitracittena[11] bhavitavyaṃ, bandhanagatā[12] mokṣitavyā[13] tasya[14] bhagavato bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya [15)]tādṛśā pūjā kartavyā yathāpūrvoktā[(15]. tasya rājñaḥ[16] kṣatriyasya[17] mūrdhābhiṣiktasyaitena[18] kuśalamūlena[19] tasya bhagavato

bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya pūrvapraṇidhānaviśeṣeṇa[20] tatra viṣaye kṣemam[21] bhaviṣyati, subhikṣam[22], kālena [23)]vātavṛṣṭi-sasyaṃ saṃpatsyati[(23]; sarve ca viṣayanivāsinaḥ satvā[24] arogā sukhitā prāmodyabahulā bhaviṣyaṃti; na ca tatra viṣaye duṣṭayakṣa-rākṣasabhūtapiśācā satvānām[25] viheṭhayanti[26] [27)]sarvadurnimittā na paśyanti[(27]. tasya rājñaḥ[28] kṣatriyasya[29] mūrdhābhiṣiktasyāyur-varṇabalārogyaiśvaryābhivṛddhir[30] bhaviṣyati.

[1)] X: -ānanta. [2)] X,Y: rājñā. [3)] X: kṣatryāṇām. [4)] X: -ābhiktānām. [5)] X: -opāxsā; T: sequence of clauses is again somewhat different in T. [6)] Y: -upasthitāḥ. [7)] X: svacakrapīḍā [vā pa]racakrapīḍā vā; T: raṅ gi dmag tshogs sam / pha rol gyi dmag tshogs kyi gnod pa 'am /. [8)(8] X: candra-graxxxgra(ha)pīḍā vā · axxxpīḍā vā; T: rgyu skar gyi gnod pa 'am / gza' zla ba'i gnod pa 'am / gza' ñi ma'i gnod pa 'am / dus ma yin pa'i rluṅ daṅ char gyi gnod pa 'am / than pa'i gnod pa yaṅ ruṅ ste / gnod pa daṅ / nad 'go ba daṅ / 'khrug pa źig ñe bar gnas par gyur na (for the last three see n.5 above). Judging from T, X has omitted nakṣatrapīḍā and akālena vātavṛṣṭipīḍā; on the other hand T's gza' zla ba'i gnod pa 'am / gza' ñi ma'i gnod pa corresponds to X's candragra[hasūrya]gra(ha)pīḍā and not to Y. Ms. Z begins again with [anā]vṛṣṭipīḍā vā. [9)] X: rāja; Z: rājña. [10)] X,Z: kṣatryeṇa. [11)] X: -citena. [12)] X: vaṃndhanagatāś ca satvā; Z: bandhanagatāś ca satvā; T: btson du bzuṅ ba rnams. [13)] X: mo(ca)yitavyā; Z: mocayitavyā. [14)] X: inserts ca. [15)(15] X: yathāp(ū)rvoktā pūjā karaṇīya taxā; T: goṅ du smos pa bźin du ... de lta bur mchod pa byas. [16)] X: rāja. [17)] X,Z: kṣatryasya. [18)] X: obl.; Z: -ṣiktasya etena. [19)] T: spyi bo nas dbaṅ bskur ba de'i dge ba'i rtsa ba de daṅ / bcom ldan 'das ... gyis, suggests a ca be read here, though none of the mss. has one. [20)] X: -viśeṣa-vistareṇa. [21)] T: yul bde ba daṅ /. [22)] Y: -bhikṣaṃ; T: lo legs par 'gyur. [23)(23] X: -sasyasaṃpadā (bhavi)ṣyati; T: rluṅ daṅ char dus su ldaṅ źiṅ lo tog 'grub par 'gyur /. [24)] Y: satvāḥ. [25)] X: satvā; T: sems can rnams la. [26)] X: sing. [27)(27] X: -durnimitāni cāxxnāśayiṣyati. [28)] X: rāja; Y: rājño. [29)] X,Z: kṣatryasya. [30)] X: (-sya) āyur-... (both X. and Y:)..valā-....

[20] athāyuṣmān ānandas[1] [2)]trāṇamuktasyaivam āha[(2]: katham kulaputra parikṣīṇāyuḥ[3] punar eva vivardhate. trāṇamukto bodhisatva āha: na tvayā bhadantānanda[4] tathāgatasyāntike[5] śrutaṃ santi[6] navākālamaraṇāni[7];

8)tena mantrauṣadhiprayogā upadiṣṭā(8. santi satvā vyādhitā, na ca guruko[9] tasya vyādhi [kiṃ tu][10] bhaiṣajyopasthāyakavirahitā yadi vā vaidyā abhaiṣajyam[11] kurvanty etad[12] prathamam[13] akālamaraṇam.∞ dvitīyam akālamaraṇam yasya rājadaṇḍena kālakriyā[14]∝. tritīyam akālamaraṇam ye 'tīva pramattāḥ pramādavihāriṇas[15] teṣām amānuṣā ojam[16] apaharanti[17]∞. caturtham akālamaraṇam ye agnidāhena[18] kālaṃ kurvanti∞ paṃcamam akālamaraṇam ye udakena mariṣyaṃti[19]∞. ṣaṣṭham akālamaraṇam[20] ye siṃhavyāghraśṛgālavyāḍacaṇḍamṛgamadhyagatā[21] bhavanti[22]∞. saptamam[23] akālamaraṇam ye giritaṭāt[24] prapatanti[25]∝. aṣṭamam akālamaraṇam ye∝ viṣakākhordavetāḍaprayogena maranti.∞ navamam akālamaraṇam ye kṣuttarṣopahatā[26] āhārapānam alabhamānā[27] kālaṃ kurvanti[28]∞. 29)ete saṃkṣepeṇa mahantā akālamaraṇā nava tathāgatena nirdiṣṭāḥ(29, 30)anye cāprameyākālamaraṇāḥ(30.

1)Z: ānando. 2)(2X: trāṇamuktaṃ bodhi(satvam) e(tad av)o(cat);-Z: trāṇamu(k)t(x)xyxxxxx vam āha; T: byaṅ chub sems dpa' skyabs grol la 'di skad ces smras so. 3)X,Z: -āyu. 4)X: omits bhadanta. 5)X: -āntikā. 6)X: sati. 7)X: nakāla-; T (for the whole phrase) btsun pa kun dga' bo dus ma yin par 'chi ba dgu yod par/khyod kyis de bźin gśegs pa las ma thos sam /. 8)(8X: teṣāṃ pratikṣepeṇa satrauṣadhiprayogā upadiṣṭā; Y: tena mantroṣadhiprayogopadiṣṭa; Z: tena mantrauṣadhiprayogām upadiṣṭā; T: de'i phyir / sṅags daṅ sman gyi sbyor ba rnams bstan to /. 9)X,Z: gurukā. 10)X: ki tu. Y: omits kim tu; Z: kixxx... (from this point the remainder of Z, except the last folio containing part of the colophon (if in fact this colophon belongs to Z), is lost); T: (beginning from na ca guruko..) de nad tshabs mi che kyaṅ sman daṅ, etc. 11)Both X and Y read vaidyābhaiṣājyaṃ which could be separated as vaidyā bhaiṣajyaṃ, but the correct separation is preserved in the fragment W which begins here: ...xxxdyā abhaiṣajyaṃ, and confirmed by T: yaṅ na sman pa sman ma yin pa byed pa. The reading of X and Y represents a case of double sandhi. After -ābhaiṣajyam X adds: xxnidānaṃ k[ālam?] ku[rvan]t[i]? 12)X: (i)dam; Y: eṣa (?). 13)X: obl.; Y: prathamaṃm. 14)W,X: kṛyā. 15)Y: -vihāriṇaḥ. 16)Cf. BHSG 16.16, but W: ojopahaxx... 17)W: -opahaxx...; X: sing. 18)T: mes tshig ste. 19)X: mṛiyati; T: 'chi ba'o. 20)X: obl.; Y: -maraṇa. 21)X: xx vyāghravyāḍa-

caṃmdamrga-; T: seṅ ge daṅ / stag daṅ / wa daṅ / sbrul daṅ / gcan gzan khro bo'i. 22)X: vāsāṃ kalpayati marati instead of bhavanti; T: naṅ du chud de 'chi ba'o. 23)X: saptam. 24)X: -taṭṭa. 25)X: sing. 26)X,Y: kṣutarṣo-. 27)Y: -mānaḥ. 28)T changes the order: gaṅ dag zas daṅ skom ma rñed nas bkres pa daṅ / skom pas ñen te 'chi ba'i dus byed pa'o. 29)(29X: xmāni sa(ṃ)kṣ(e)p(x)xxvāxxxxmaraṇāni tathāgatena nirdiṣṭāni; T: mdor na 'di dag ni/de bžin gśegs pas dus ma yin par 'chi ba chen por bstan pa ste /. 30)(30X: anyāni cāprameyāxxxxlamaraṇāni; W: anye ca aprameyā-m-akālamaxx...; T: gžan yaṅ dus ma yin par 'chi ba ni graṅs med dpag tu med do /.

[21] atha[1] tatra parṣadi[2] dvādaśa mahāyakṣasenāpatayaḥ[3] sannipatitā abhūvan:[4]α kiṃbhīro[5] mahāyakṣasenāpatir[6], vajro[7] mahāyakṣasenāpatir[6], mekhilo mahāyakṣasenāpatir[6] anīlo[8] mahāyakṣasenāpatiḥ[6], sanīlo[9] mahāyakṣasenāpatir[6], indālo mahāyakṣasenāpatiḥ, pāyilo[10] mahāyakṣasenāpatir[6], māhuro mahāyakṣasenāpatiś, cindālo[11] mahāyakṣasenāpatiś, codhuro[12] mahāyakṣasenāpatir, vikalo[13] mahāyakṣasenāpatir[14] ete dvādaśa mahāyakṣasenāpataya[15] ekaikaḥ sapta sapta yakṣasahasraparivāra[16] ekavācenaiva[17] bhagavantam[18] evam āhuḥ[19]: śrutam[20] asmākam[21,22] buddhānubhāvena tasya bhagavato bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabhasya tathāgαatasya nāmadheyam;[23)] na bhūyo 'smākaṃ durgatibhayam[(23]; [24] sahitā samagrā yāvajjīvaṃ buddhaṃ śaraṇaṃ[25] gacchāmo[26], dharmaṃ śaraṇam[27] gacchāmaḥ[28], saṃghaṃ śaraṇaṃ gacchāmaḥ[29]; sarvasatvānām arthāya hitāya sukhāya autsukyaṃ kariṣyāmaḥ[30]. viśeṣeṇa yatra[31] grāme vā nagare vā janapade[32] vāraṇyāyatane vāα idaṃ sūtraṃ pracariṣyati[33]; yo vā[34] tasya bhagavato bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya nāmadheyaṃ dhārayiṣyati[35]α;[36)] vayam api te ca rakṣiṣyāmaḥ sarvopadravebhyaḥ parimocayiṣyāmaḥ sarvāśām paripūrayiṣyāmaḥ[(36]ω. atha khalu[37] bhagavāṃs teṣāṃ mahāyakṣasenāpatīnām[38] sādhukāram adāsīt[39]: sādhu sādhu mahāyakṣasenāpatayaḥ[40] yad yūyam[41] tasya[42] bhagavato bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya kṛtajñatām anusmaramāṇāḥ[43] sarvasatvānāṃ hitāya pratipannā[44].

[1] X: inserts khalu. [2] X: parṣāyāṃ. [3] X: -senāpataya. [4] X: inserts yaduta. [5] X: inserts nāma after the name here and throughout. [6] Throughout the list X has -pati; Y always -patiḥ. [7] W: vajro nāma; X: vajraś ca nāma. [8] X: obl., showing mekhilo nāma mahā(yakṣa)xxxxxxxxxmahāyakṣa, etc.; -senapati anīlo nāma would fill this space exactly. [9] X: sanilo. [10] Y: pā-i-lo. [11] X: vidālo. [12] X: caundhuro. [13] X: obl., showing caundhuro nāma maxxx-senāpatixxxxxxxyakṣasenā(pati); (ma)hāyakṣa(senāpati) vikalo nāma mahā-(yakṣasenā(pati)) would fill the space exactly. [14] This is the end of the enumeration in Y in spite of the fact that only eleven yakṣasenāpatis are named. The curious thing is that X appears to have had exactly the same list as Y. Although two names are obliterated in X, it is clear that it had contained only eleven names; the number of akṣaras exactly corresponds (allowing, that is, for the uniform insertion of nāma in X) to the number of akṣaras in Y (cf.notes 8 and 13); and in spite of some variation in spelling X appears to have given the names in the same order. T has twelve names, but since in a number of cases determining the Skt.name to which the individual Tib. names correspond is far from easy, I am now not able to say where in the Skt. list the missing name belonged or to attempt a reconstruction. [15] Y: -senāpatayaḥ. [16] Y: -parivāraḥ; X: -parivāra te (this is the beginning of the 2nd line of fol. 38a; the 1st line is mostly obl.); T: gnod sbyin gyi sde dpon chen po re re la yaṅ / g-yog gnod sbyin bdun 'bum bdun 'bum yod pa ste / de dag gis (supporting X's te). [17] X: ekakaṇṭhena; Y: note the instr. of a stem vāca (unrecorded in BHSG); T: (de dag gis) tshig gcig tu (neither T nor X has an eva). [18] X: bhagavatam. [19] X: āhu. [20] Y: śruto (X also probably read śruto, but it is partially obl.). [21] X: obl.; Y: 'smakaṃ; T: bdag cag gis. [22] X: adds -r bhagavata (the superscribed -r may indicate that X, instead of asmākam (n.21), had asmābhir). [23] (23 T: bdag cag la yaṅ ṅan 'gror mchi ba'i 'jigs pa 'byuṅ bar mi 'gyur ro /. [24] X: inserts te vayaṃ before sahitā; T: de na bdag cag. [25] X: śarana. [26] X: gacchāma; Y: gacchāmaḥ. [27] X: dharma saraṇa. [28] X: gacām(x)x. [29] X: ..xxcāma. [30] X: [karilsyāmahe. [31] X: yatrāgrāme. [32] X: omits janapade. [33] T: spyod pa daṅ /. [34] T: gaṅ na. [35] X: obl.; Y: pl. [36] (36 X: xxoxsthānaṃ kariṣyati tāvat vayaṃ bhagavat satvādrakṣiṣyām(x)xxxlayixy(x)xxxxxxxxya par(i)m(o)cayi(ṣ)-y(x)xxxxsām āśāṃ paripūrayiṣyāma (cf. Dutt 31.5f); Y: ... sarvāśā pari-pūrayiṣyāḥ; T: ('chaṅ ba daṅ) / mchod pa daṅ / rim gro bgyid pa'i sems can de dag la bdag cag gis bsruṅ bar bgyi / yoṅs su bskyaṅ bar bgyi / gnod pa thams cad las yoṅs su thar bar bgyi / bsam pa thams cad yoṅs su rdzogs par bgyi'o /. [37] T: de nas. [38] Y: -senāpatīnā. [39] X: adāt; for Y cf. BHSG

32.55. 40) X: -senāpatīnām. 41) Y: yūya. 42) Ms. Y ends after the first syllable of tasya. From this point to the end of our text we have only Ms. X. We give it here, as before, in brackets. 43) X: anusmax(mā)mānā; T: is structured differently: ... bai dū rya'i 'od de la byas pa gzo źiṅ rjes su draṅ la. 44) T: sems can thams cad la phan pa'i phyir źugs pa.

[22] 1) athāyuṣmān ānando(1 2) bhagavantam etad avocat(2: ko nāmāyam bhagavan[3] dharmaparyāyaḥ[4] katham cainam[5] dhārayāmi. bhagavān āha: tena hy ānanda dharmaparyāyam[6] bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya pūrvapraṇidhānaviśeṣavistaram[7] iti dhāraya[8]; dvādaśānām mahāyakṣasenāpatīnām[9] pra xxxxxxxxx(rava)xxxxxxxxxti nāma dhāraya[10].

1)(1 X: xxxxxnamndo; T: de nas tshe daṅ ldan pa kun dga' bo. 2)(2 This is expanded - by means of a typical formula - in T: (kun dga' bo) stan las laṅs te / bla gos phrag pa gcig tu gzar nas/pus mo g-yas pa'i lha ṅa sa la btsugs te / bcom ldan 'das ga la ba de logs su thal mo sbyar ba btud nas/bcom ldan 'das la 'di skad ces gsol to /. 3) X: bhagava. 4) X: dharmaparyāya. 5) X: caina. 6) T: inserts 'di. 7) X: pūrvapraxxxviśeṣa-; T: smon lam gyi khyad par rgyas pa. 8) T inserts here: byaṅ chub sems dpa' lag na rdo rjes dam bcas pa źes bya bar yaṅ zuṅ śig / las kyi sgrib pa thams cad rnam par sbyoṅ źiṅ ... ba thams cad yoṅs su skoṅ ba źes bya bar yaṅ zuṅ śig /. 9) X: mahāyaxxxpatīnām. 10) T: gnod sbyin gyi sde dpon chen po bcu gñis kyis dam bcas pa źes bya bar yaṅ źuṅ śig / (for all of T [22] cf. *StP*).

[23] idam avocat[1] bhagavān[2]. āttamanā[3] mamjuśrīḥ kumārabhūta[4] 5) āyuṣmāṃś cānandas trāṇamuktaś ca bodhisatvas te ca bodhisatvās te ca mahāśrāvakās te ca rājāmātyabrāhmaṇagṛhapatayaḥ sadevamānuṣāsurax xxxrvaś ca loko bhagavato bhāṣitam abhyanandam(5.

1) X: avoca. 2) T: bcom ldan 'das kyis de skad ces bka' stsal nas /. 3) X: āmtamanā. 4) X: mamj(u)xxmārabhūta. 5)(5 X: āyuṣmāṃś cānanda trāṇamuktaś ca xxxstva •te ca bodhisatvās te ca mahāśrāvakās te ca rājāmāxbrāhmaṇagṛhapataya • sade(vamānuṣā)su(ra)xxxxrvaś ca ... . T here differs considerably: 'jam dpal gźon nur gyur pa daṅ / byaṅ chub sems dpa' de dag daṅ / gsaṅ ba pa'i bdag po lag na rdo rje daṅ / thams cad daṅ ldan pa'i 'khor de dag daṅ / lha daṅ /

mi daṅ / lha ma yin daṅ / dri zar bcas pa'i 'jig rten yi raṅs te/bcom ldan 'das kyis gsuṅs pa la mṅon par bstod do / . This again corresponds exactly to the wording of *StP*.

[24] [1)]āryabhaiṣajyagurur nāma mahāyānasūtram samāptam[1)]]

1)(1X: āxx(x)ṣajyaguru nāma ... T: 'phags pa bcom ldan 'das sman gyi bla bai ḍū rya'i 'od kyi sṅon gyi smon lam gyi khyad par rgyas pa źes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo rdzogs so /.

'PHAGS PA BCOM LDAN 'DAS SMAN GYI BLA BAI ḌŪ RYA'I

'OD KYI SŃON GYI SMON LAM GYI KHYAD PAR

RGYAS PA ŹES BYA BA THEG PA CHEN

PO'I MDO

*

THE TIBETAN TRANSLATION OF A SANSKRIT TEXT OF THE BHAIṢAJYAGURU-SŪTRA

Introduction.

It will, of course, be obvious from what I have said in the introduction to the Sanskrit text that my interest in the Tibetan translation of *Bhg* is - at this point in time - secondary. A critical edition of it is here added for the convenience of the reader, for the aid it might offer in approaching the Sanskrit text, and because it has become a convention to edit the Tibetan translation when one edits its Sanskrit 'original'. But its inclusion here should not be taken to imply that I think there is any *direct* relationship between this Tibetan translation and the Sanskrit text of Redaction A from Gilgit. Any relationship has yet to be determined; and even now it is clear that this Tibetan translation is not a direct translation of the Gilgit text of Redaction A.

I have not studied the Tibetan translation in detail because I was first of all interested in the *Bhaiṣajyaguru-sūtra at Gilgit,* and because any detailed study of the Tibetan would have required that Redaction B also be critically edited. In addition to this, a study of the Tibetan text would also have required that a number of other texts be studied in detail. Among these other texts the *Ārya-sapta-tathāgata-pūrva-praṇidhāna-viśeṣa-vistara-sūtra* (Pek. Vol. 6, no. 135), the *Ārya-tathāgata-vaidūrya-prabha-nāma-baladhana-samādhi-dhāraṇi* (Pek. Vol. 6, no. 137) and at least three commentaries on the first of these (Pek. Vol. 80, nos. 3953, 3954, 3955) would have to be taken into account (I have read only the first two texts). In short, this would have required a separate project.

Instead of such a project I have simply made an edition of the Tibetan translation of *Bhg* which I could use in editing my Sanskrit text and in making my translation. This edition is based on the Derge, Narthang, Peking and Lhasa versions of the Kanjur text. And I have taken the Derge version as my main text. The punctuation in my edition is that of this version. Variants from the other versions are marked by 'Arabic' numbers. It is necessary to note this because my edition for paragraphs [4] through [21] has in fact two separate critical apparatuses. The first marked, as I said, by 'Arabic' numbers, gives variants from the versions of *Bhg*; the second, marked by lower case letters from a to z,

gives variants from the Derge, Narthang, Peking and Lhasa versions of the *Ārya-sapta-tathāgata-pūrva-praṇidhāna-viśeṣa-vistara-sūtra* (Tib.: *'phags pa de bžin gšegs pa bdun gyi sṅon gyi smon lam gyi khyad par rgyas pa šes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo*) = *StP*. *StP* is a text in two bam po. The first bam po deals with six Tathāgatas, each in the same way: it first gives his name; then the location, name, and description of his buddhafield; then it enumerates in the yadā ... tadā formulā his vows. The pattern is almost exactly the same as that found in *Bhg* [4] - [6] (for these Buddhas see S. Hummel, "'Der Medizin-Buddha und seine Begleiter' im lamaistischen Pantheon", *Sinologica* 2 (1950) 81-104). The second bam po deals exclusively with Bhaiṣajyaguru and the text of this bam po - all but the very end - is almost word-for-word the same as the text of the Tibetan translation of *Bhg* (I am at this point not sure who 'borrowed' from who; arguments could be made to support the priority of either.) I had, then, for the bulk of the text eight separate versions. But in spite of this the number of true variants is very small, most of them are scribal errors or 'misspellings'.

To my knowledge there are only two small fragments of a Tibetan translation of this 'text' from Tun-huang, neither of which was positively identified by Lalou (M. Lalou, *Inventaire des manuscrits tibêtains de Touen-houang, conservés à la Bibliothèque Nationale (Fonds Pelliot tibêtain)* I (Paris: 1939) nos. 247 and 248). Although I cannot say whether these fragments come from *Bhg* or *StP*, no. 247 corresponds to the text found at [7]14; and no. 248 to that found at [18]8.

According to the colophons the translation of *Bhg* was made by Jinamitra, Dānaśīla, Ye šes sde, etc.; that of *StP* by Jinamitra, Dānaśīla, Śīlendrabodhi and Ye šes sde. Both, therefore, were probably translated at the beginning of the 9th century A.D. (J.W. de Jong, "Notes a propos des colophons du Kanjur", *Zentralasiatische Studien* 6 (1972) 507, 524).

Finally, it should be noted that both *Bhg* and *StP* are classified in the Tantra section of the Kanjur. This is a little strange since *Bhg* contains nothing which could be called Tantric, and *StP* contains at the most a few short (non-tantric) dhāraṇīs (on both points cf. pp. 270f below). An interesting passage in F.D. Lessing & A. Wayman, *Mkhas grub rje's Fundamentals of the Buddhist Tantras* (The Hague: 1968) may provide us with some idea of the kind of thinking which underlies this classification:

"Some claim that the following two works belong to the *sūtra* category, because they are set down as sūtras in former catalogues: 1. the *Saptatathāgata-pūrvapraṇidhāna-viśeṣavistāra-sūtra* ...; 2. the *Bhagavato bhaiṣajyaguru-vaiḍūryaprabhasya pūrvapraṇidhānaviśeṣavistāra-sūtra* ... Others claim that they belong to the *mantra* category, because the ācārya Śāntarakṣita has composed a rite [based on them] (Toh. 3133, no author listed). He composed it consistent with the structure of kriyā-caryā rites, in that he has the preliminaries of observing the Sabbath (upoṣadha), and so on. They claim, moreover, that the (two works) belong to the Tathāgata family. Our own school places them in the *mantra* category. They are also explained as belonging to the *mantra* category in the *Sarvadhāraṇimaṇḍala-vidhi* (Toh. 3136, by Ratnakīrti), called 'Bright sun-rays'. However, the family to which they belong is not certain." It would appear that in this case at least the Kanjur classification is based on factors external to the texts themselves.

I add here two concordances of the material on which my edition is based.

Concordance of the Ḱanjur Editions of the 'phags pa bcom ldan 'das sman gyi bla bai dū rya'i 'od kyi sṅon gyi smon lam gyi khyad par rgyas pa źes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo

Paragraph No.	Derge	Narthang	Peking	Lhasa
00	da 274a1	tha 470a6	da 253b7	ta 419a3
0	274a2	470b1	253b8	419a5
1	274a2	470b1	253b8	419a5
2	274a4	470b4	254a2	419b1
3	274a6	470b7	254a5	419b4
4	274b1	471a3	254a7	419b7
5.1	274b4	471a7	254b2	420a5
5.2	274b6	471b3	254b4	420b1
5.3	275a3	471b7	254b7	420b5
5.4	275a4	472a2	255a1	420b7
5.5	275a6	472a4	255a3	421a3
5.6	275b1	472a7	255a5	421a6
5.7	275b3	472b3	255a7	421b2
5.8	275b5	472b6	255b2	421b6
5.9	275b7	473a2	255b4	422a2
5.10	276a2	473a5	255b6	422a4
5.11	276a4	473b1	255b8	422a7
5.12	276a6	473b4	256a2	422b3
5.13	276b2	474a1	256a5	422b7
6	276b3	474a2	256a6	423a1
7	277a1	474b2	256b3	423b2
8	277a7	475a5	257a2	424a5
9	277b5	475b6	257a8	424b6
10	278a4	476a7	257b6	425a[illegible]

Paragraph No.	Derge	Narthang	Peking	Lhasa
11	da 278b2	tha 476b6	da 258a3	ta 425b6
12	279a1	477b2	258b1	426b2
13	279a2	477b2	258b2	426b3
14	279a6	478a2	258b7	427a3
15	280a1	479a1	259a8	428a2
16	280a7	479b2	259b6	428b3
17	281a3	480b3	260b2	429b5
18	281b3	481a6	261a1	430b1
19	282a1	481b4	261a6	430b6
20	282a6	482a5	261b4	431a7
21	282b6	482b7	262a2	432a2
22	283b1	483b4	262b3	432b7
23	283b4	484a2	262b6	433a5
24	283b6	484a4	262b8	433a7
colophon	283b6	484a5	262b8	433b1

Concordance of the Kanjur Editions of the <u>'phags pa de bźin gśegs pa bdun gyi sṅon gyi smon lam gyi khyad par rgyas pa źes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo</u>

Paragraph No.	Derge	Narthang	Peking	Lhasa
4	da 261a5	tha 452a6	da 242a3	ta 400a4
5.1	261b1	452b3	242a6	400b2
5.2	261b3	452b6	242a8	400b5
5.3	261b5	453a3	242b3	401a2
5.4	261b7	453a5	242b5	401a5
5.5	262a2	453a7	242b7	401a7
5.6	262a4	453b3	243a1	401b3
5.7	262a6	453b6	243a3	401b6
5.8	262b1	454a3	243a6	402a3
5.9	262b3	454a5	243a8	402a5
5.10	262b5	454b1	243b1	402b1
5.11	262b7	454b4	243b4	402b4
5.12	263a2	454b6	243b5	402b7
5.13	263a4	455a3	243b8	403a4
6	263a5	455a5	244a1	403a6
7	263b3	455b5	244a6	403b6
8	264a3	456a7	244b6	404b2
9	264b1	457a1	245a3	405a4
10	264b6	457b2	245b1	405b5
11	265a4	458a1	245b6	406a5
12	265b3	458b4	246a5	407a1
13	265b3	458b5	246a5	407a2
14	266a1	459a4	246b2	407b2
15	266b2	460a3	247a4	408b2
16	266b7	460b4	247b2	409a2

Paragraph No.	Derge	Narthang	Peking	Lhasa
17	da 267b3	tha 461b4	da 248a5	ta 410a4
18	268a3	462a7	248b4	411a1
19	268b1	462b6	249a1	411a7
20	268b6	463a7	249a7	412a1
21	269a5-269b6	464a1-464b6	249b5-250a6	412b3-413a7

The

Tibetan Text

[00] rgya gar skad du / ā rya bha ga vān bhai ṣa dzya[1] gu ru bai ḍū rya pra bha sya[2] pū rba[3] pra ṇi dhā[4] na bi śe ṣa bi sta[5] ra nā ma ma hā yā na sū tra /

bod skad du / 'phags pa bcom ldan 'das sman gyi bla bai ḍū rya'i 'od kyi[6] sṅon gyi smon lam gyi khyad par rgyas pa źes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo /

1)N,D,L: dzye. 2)N: pra bhā sa. 3)P: pū rka; D: pū rbba. 4)P,N,L: dha. 5)N,D,L: stā. 6)P inserts rgyal po'i.

[0] saṅs rgyas daṅ byaṅ chub sems dpa' thams cad la phyag 'tshal lo[1] /

1)Skt differs completely; cf. Skt 0 and n .1.

[1] 'di skad bdag gis[1] thos pa dus gcig na / bcom ldan 'das yul rgyu brgyu źiṅ yaṅs pa can du[2] byon te / yaṅs pa can na rol mo'i sgra can[3] gyi śiṅ ljon pa'i[4] druṅ na dge sloṅ brgyad[5] stoṅ gi dge sloṅ gi dge 'dun chen po daṅ / thabs gcig[6] tu bźugs te / byaṅ chub sems dpa' sum khri drug stoṅ daṅ yaṅ thabs gcig[7] tu rgyal po daṅ / blon po daṅ / bram ze daṅ / khyim bdag rnams daṅ / lha daṅ / lha ma yin daṅ / nam mkha' ldiṅ daṅ / mi 'am ci daṅ / lto 'phye chen po rnams kyis yoṅs su[8] bskor ciṅ mdun gyis bltas te chos ston to //

1)N: gi. 2)N: na. 3)N: has sgra gcan instead. 4)P: ba'i. 5)N: brgya. 6)D: cig. 7)D: cig. 8)N: here and almost always throughout has yoṅsu; not noted hereafter.

[2] de nas sańs rgyas kyi mthus chos kyi rgyal bu 'jam dpal stan las lańs te / bla[1] gos phrag pa gcig tu bgos[2] nas pus mo g-yas pa'i lha ńa sa la btsugs te / bcom ldan 'das ga la ba de logs su thal mo sbyar ba btud nas bcom ldan 'das la 'di skad ces gsol to / gań thos pas sems can rnams kyi las kyi sgrib pa yońs su byań bar 'gyur ba dań / slad ma'i tshe slad ma'i dus su dam pa'i chos ltar bcos pa 'byuń ba na / sems can de dag rjes su gzuń ba'i slad du de bźin gśegs pa de dag gi mtshan dań / sńon gyi smon lam gyi khyad par rgyas pa bcom ldan 'das kyis bstan du gsol /

[1] P: omits bla. [2] P: gzar; cf. Skt [2] n.2: cīvaraṃ prāvṛtya / uttarāsaṅgaṃ kṛtvā.

[3] de nas bcom ldan 'das kyis 'jam dpal gźon nur gyur pa la legs so źes bya ba byin te / 'jam dpal legs so legs so[1] / 'jam dpal khyod kyis sñiń rje dpag tu med pa bskyed nas sems can las kyi sgrib pa sna tshogs kyis bsgribs pa rnams dań / lha dań mi rnams kyi don dań / phan pa dań bde ba'i phyir gsol ba 'debs pa ni legs so / 'jam dpal de'i phyir legs par rab tu ñon la yid la zuń[2] śig dań bśad do / 'jal dpal gźon nur gyur pas bcom ldan 'das de bźin no źes gsol nas / bcom ldan 'das kyi l ar ñan pa dań /

[1] N: legso legso. [2] L: zuńs.

[4] bcom ldan 'das kyis de[1] la 'di skad ces bka' stsal to / 'jam dpal śar phyogs logs su[2,a] sańs rgyas kyi źiń[3] 'di nas sańs rgyas kyi źiń[3] gań ga'i[4,b] kluń bcu'i bye ma sñed 'das pa na 'jig rten gyi khams bai ḍū rya'i[5,c] snań ba źes bya ba yod de / de na de bźin gśegs pa dgra bcom pa yań dag par rdzogs pa'i sańs rgyas rig pa dań źabs su[6,d] ldan pa / bde bar gśegs pa / 'jig rten mkhyen pa / skyes[7] bu 'dul ba'i kha lo sgyur ba[8,e] / bla na med pa / lha dań mi rnams kyi ston pa /

saṅs rgyas bcom ldan 'das sman gyi bla bai ḍū rya'i 'od ces[f] bya ba bžugs so[9] / 'jam dpal bcom ldan 'das de bžin gšegs pa[g] sman gyi bla bai ḍū rya'i 'od[h] de / sṅon byaṅ chub sems dpa'i spyad pa spyod pa na smon lam chen po bcu gñis po 'di dag btab bo / bcu gñis gaṅ že na /

1) L: da. 2) N: logsu; almost always throughout; not noted hereafter. 3)(3 N: omits 'di nas saṅs rgyas kyi žiṅ. 4) N,L: gaṅgā'i. 5) P: bai dū rya, dental d throughout; D: bai ḍū ryar. 6) N: žabsu. 7) N: skye bu. 8) P,N: bsgyur ba. 9) D: bžug so; N: bžugso.

a) N: logsu, almost always throughout; not noted hereafter. b) N: gaṅga'i. c) P,N,D,L: bai ḍū ryar; P has dental d throughout. d) N: žabsu. e) N,L: bsgyur ba. f) N,D,L: add ('od) kyi rgyal po; žes for ces. g) N,L: insert here dgra bcom pa yaṅ dag par rdzogs pa'i saṅs rgyas. h) N,L: add ('od) kyi rgyal po.

[5.1] de'i smon lam chen po daṅ po ni gaṅ gi tshe bdag ma 'oṅs pa'i dus na bla na med pa yaṅ dag par rdzogs pa'i byaṅ chub mṅon par rdzogs par saṅs rgyas pa de'i tshe[a] / bdag gi lus kyi 'od kyis 'jig rten gyi khams graṅs med dpag tu med ciṅ dpag[b] gis mi laṅ ba dag lham me lhan ne lhaṅ ṅer gyur cig / sems can thams cad skyes bu chen po'i mtshan sum cu[c] rtsa gñis daṅ / dpe byad bzaṅ po brgyad cus[1,d] legs par brgyan par gyur te / bdag ci 'dra ba de[2,e] bžin du sems can thams cad kyaṅ de[3,f] 'dra bar gyur cig ces btab bo /

1) P: bcus. 2) P: omits de. 3) P: inserts daṅ after de

a) P,N,D,L: insert here bdag byaṅ chub thob pa na. b) D: dbag. c) P: bcu. d) P: bcus. e) P,D: omit de. f) N,L: insert daṅ after de.

[5.2] de'i smon lam chen po gñis pa ni gaṅ gi tshe bdag ma 'oṅs pa'i dus na / bla na med pa yaṅ dag par rdzogs pa'i byaṅ chub [a)] mṅon par rdzogs par saṅs rgyas pa de'i tshe[1] bdag byaṅ chub(a thob pa na[2] / lus nor bu rin po che bai ḍū rya [b)] ci[3] 'dra ba[4] de 'dra bar phyi naṅ(b šin tu yoṅs su dag pa daṅ / dri ma med la[c] 'od gsal ba daṅ / kho laṅ

yaṅs śiṅ che ba daṅ / dpal daṅ gzi brjid 'bar ba daṅ / legs par gnas pa daṅ / ñi ma daṅ zla ba bas lhag pa'i[5] 'od zer gyi dra ba rnams kyis legs par brgyan[6] par gyur cig / de na[7] sems can gaṅ dag 'jig rten gyi bar dag tu[8] skyes pa dag daṅ / gaṅ dag yaṅ mi'i 'jig rten 'di na mtshan mo mun pa mun nag gi naṅ na phyogs[d] tha dad par 'gro ba de dag bdag gi 'od kyis[e] phyogs[f] dga' mgur[9,g] 'gro bar gyur cig / las rnams[h] kyaṅ byed par gyur cig ces btab bo /

[1]N: has what appears to be de dag. [2]L: ni. [3]P,N: ji. [4]N: bar. [5]N,L: lhag par. [6]N: rgyan. [7]N: de nas. [8]L: bar du. [9]P: dgur; N: 'gur.

a)(aN,L: omit mṅon par rdzogs par saṅs rgyas pa de'i tshe bdag byaṅ chub. b)(bL: has instead ci 'dra bar phyi naṅ. c)P,L: med pa. d)D,L: add rnams su. e)N: 'od kyi. f)N: adds rnams. g)P,N: dgur h)N,D,L: dge ba'i las rnams instead.

[5.3] de'i smon lam chen po gsum pa ni gaṅ gi tshe bdag ma 'oṅs pa'i dus na / bla na med pa yaṅ dag par rdzogs pa'i byaṅ chub mṅon par rdzogs par saṅs rgyas pa de'i tshe bdag byaṅ chub thob pa na[1] / bdag gi śes rab daṅ thabs dpag tu med pas sems can gyi khams dpag gis mi laṅ ba dag loṅs spyod mi zad pa daṅ ldan par gyur te / su yaṅ cis kyaṅ brel ba med par gyur cig ces btab bo /

[1]P: nas.

[5.4] de'i smon lam chen po bźi pa ni gaṅ gi tshe bdag ma 'oṅs pa'i dus na / bla na med pa yaṅ dag par rdzogs pa'i byaṅ chub mṅon par rdzogs par[1] saṅs rgyas pa de'i tshe bdag byaṅ chub thob pa na / sems can gaṅ dag lam ṅan par źugs pa de dag byaṅ chub kyi lam la dgod[a] par bya'o / b)ñan thos kyi lam du źugs pa daṅ(b / raṅ saṅs rgyas kyi[c] lam du źugs pa de dag thams cad ni theg pa chen po la gzud par bya'o źes btab bo[2]

[1]N: omits rdzogs par. [2]N: bi.

[a]P: bgod. [b](b N,L: instead of ñan thos kyi lam du žugs pa daṅ have only ñan thos daṅ. [c]N,L: gyi.

[5.5] de'i smon lam chen po lṅa pa ni gaṅ gi tshe bdag ma 'oṅs pa'i dus na / bla na med pa yaṅ dag par rdzogs pa'i [a]byaṅ chub mṅon par rdzogs par(a saṅs rgyas pa de'i tshe bdag byaṅ chub thob pa na / sems can gaṅ dag bdag gi gan na tshaṅs par spyad pa spyod pa daṅ / de bžin du sems can gžan dpag tu med ciṅ dpag gis mi laṅ ba de dag thams cad kyaṅ bdag gi miṅ thos nas / bdag gi mthus sdom pa gsum gyis bsdams pa daṅ / tshul khrims ñams pa med par gyur cig / su yaṅ tshul khrims log par žugs te / ṅan 'gror[b] 'gro bar ma gyur cig ces btab bo /

a)(a N: omits byaṅ chub mṅon par rdzogs par. [b]P: ṅan par instead

[5.6] de'i smon lam chen po drug pa ni gaṅ gi tshe bdag ma 'oṅs pa'i dus na / bla na med pa yaṅ dag par rdzogs pa'i byaṅ chub mṅon par rdzogs par saṅs rgyas pa de'i tshe bdag byaṅ chub thob pa na / sems can gaṅ su dag lus ṅan pa daṅ / dbaṅ po ma tshaṅ ba daṅ / mdog mi sdug pa daṅ / bems po daṅ / yan lag skyon can daṅ / sgur[1,a] po daṅ / śa bkra can daṅ / žar ba daṅ / loṅ ba daṅ / 'on pa daṅ /[2] smyon par gyur pa daṅ(2 / gžan yaṅ gaṅ su dag[b] lus la nad kyis btab pa de dag gis[3] bdag gi miṅ thos nas thams cad dbaṅ po tshaṅ žiṅ yan lag yoṅs su rdzogs par gyur cig ces btab bo /

[1]N: rgur po. 2)(2 P: smyo bar gyur pa daṅ; N,L: smyon pa daṅ (omitting gyur pa). [3]N: gi.

[a]N: rgur po. [b]P,N,D,L: gaṅ dag.

[5.7] de'i smon lam chen po bdun pa ni / gaṅ gi tshe bdag ma 'oṅs pa'i dus na / bla na med pa yaṅ dag par rdzogs pa'i byaṅ chub mṅon par rdzogs par saṅs rgyas pa de'i tshe bdag byaṅ chub thob pa na / sems can

gaṅ su dag nad sna tshogs kyis[a] yoṅs su[1] gzir ba / skyabs med pa / mgon med pa / 'tshog chas daṅ / sman mi bdog pa / dpuṅ gñen med pa / dbul ba / sdug bsṅal ba gaṅ dag gi rna lam du bdag gi[b] miṅ grag pa[c] de dag ni[d] nad[2] thams cad rab tu źi bar gyur cig / byaṅ chub gyi mthar thug gi bar du nad med ciṅ gnod pa med par gnas par[3] gyur cig ces btab bo /

1) D: omits yoṅs su. 2) P: has nas for ni nad; N,L: simply nad, omitting ni. 3) N: omits gnas par.

a) N,D,L: insert lus here. b) N: bdag gis. c) N: grags pa. d) P: de dag; N,D,L: de dag gi.

[5.8] de'i smon lam chen po brgyad pa ni gaṅ gi tshe bdag ma 'oṅs pa'i dus na[1] / bla na med pa yaṅ dag par rdzogs pa'i byaṅ chub mṅon par rdzogs par saṅs rgyas pa de'i tshe bdag byaṅ chub thob pa na / bud med gaṅ la la bud med kyi skyon brgya dag gis kun nas ñon moṅs par gyur pa / bud med kyi dṅos po la smod pa / bud med kyi skye gnas las yoṅs su thar bar 'dod pa de dag bud med kyi dṅos po las[a] log par gyur cig / byaṅ chub kyi mthar thug gi bar du[2] skyes pa'i dbaṅ po byuṅ[3,b] bar gyur cig ces btab bo /

1) N: omits na. 2) D: omits du. 3) N,L: 'byuṅ.

a) N,D,L: insert slar. b) P,D,L: 'byuṅ.

[5.9] de'i smon lam chen po dgu pa ni gaṅ gi tshe bdag ma 'oṅs pa'i dus na / bla na med pa yaṅ[1] dag par rdzogs pa'i byaṅ chub mṅon par rdzogs par saṅs rgyas pa de'i tshe bdag byaṅ chub thob pa na / sems can thams cad bdud kyi źags pa rnams las yoṅs su thar bar bya'o / lta ba tha dad pa[a] mi mthun pa ziṅ ziṅ[2,b] pas mi mthun par gyur pa dag yaṅ dag pa'i lta ba la dgod par bya'o / mthar gyis[3] byaṅ chub sems dpa'i spyod[4] pa bstan par bya'o źes btab bo /

1) N: med(?). 2) N: ziṅ gziṅ. 3) N: gyi. 4) N: spyad.

a) N,D,L: tha dad ciṅ. b) N: gziṅ gziṅ.

[5.10] de'i smon lam chen po bcu pa ni gaṅ gi tshe bdag ma 'oṅs pa'i dus na / bla na med pa yaṅ dag par rdzogs pa'i byaṅ chub mṅon par rdzogs par saṅs rgyas pa de'i tshe / bdag byaṅ chub thob pa na sems can gaṅ[1] su dag rgyal po'i 'jigs pas skrag pa daṅ / gaṅ dag bciṅ ba daṅ / brdeg pa daṅ / go rar gźug pa daṅ / gsad[2,a] par 'os pa / sgyu[3,b] du mas kun tu[4] gtses pa / ṅa rgyal daṅ bral ba lus daṅ ṅag daṅ sems sdug bsṅal gyis ñen pa de dag bdag gi bsod nams kyi mthus gnod pa thams cad las yoṅs su thar bar gyur cig ces btab bo /

1)N,L: omit gaṅ. 2)N: bsaḍ. 3)P,N,L: rgyu. 4)N,L: omit kun tu.
a)N: bsad. b)N,L: rgyu.

[5.11] de'i smon lam chen po bcu gcig pa ni / gaṅ gi tshe bdag ma 'oṅs pa'i dus na bla na med pa yaṅ dag par rdzogs pa'i byaṅ chub mṅon par rdzogs par saṅs rgyas pa de'i tshe / bdag byaṅ chub thob pa na sems can gaṅ su dag[1] bkres[2] pa daṅ / skom pa'i me rab tu 'bar ba / kha zas tshol ba la rab tu brtson pa / sdig pa'i las byed pa de dag bdag gis kha dog daṅ / dri daṅ / ror ldan pa'i kha zas kyis lus tshim[a] par byas te[3] / phyis chos kyi ros śin tu bde ba la dgod par bya'o źes btab bo /

1)N,L: gaṅ dag, omitting su. 2)P: dkres. 3)N: omits te.
a)N,L: sim.

[5.12] de bźin gśegs pa de'i smon lam chen po bcu gñis pa ni gaṅ gi tshe bdag ma 'oṅs pa'i dus na / bla na med pa yaṅ dag par rdzogs pa'i byaṅ chub mṅon par rdzogs par saṅs rgyas pa de'i tshe[a] / sems can gaṅ su dag[1] sgren mo bgo ba med pa[b] dbul ba / sdug bsṅal ba / graṅ[2] ba daṅ / tsha ba daṅ / sbraṅ bu daṅ / śa sbraṅ dag gis ñin mtshan du sdug bsṅal gyi tshor ba myoṅ ba c)dag la bdag gis(c gos yoṅs su 3)spyad par 'os pa tshon(3 sna tshogs su[4] kha bsgyur[5,d] ba dag sbyin par bya'o / ji ltar 'dod pa bźin du rin po che'i rgyan sna tshogs daṅ[e] / spud pa daṅ / phreṅ

ba daṅ / spos daṅ / byug pa daṅ / rol mo'i sgra daṅ[6] / pheg rdob pa rnams kyis sems can rnams kyi bsam pa thams cad yoṅs su rdzogs par gyur cig ces btab bo[f] /

1) N,L: su dag, omitting gaṅ. 2) P: grad. 3)(3 P: spyad pa tshon, omitting -r 'os pa. 4) N,L: omit su, having instead yoṅs su (kha bsgyur ba). 5) P: sgyur. 6) P: omits daṅ.

a) P,N,D,L: add bdag byaṅ chub thob pa na. b) N: omits bgo ba med pa. c)(c P,D: de dag la bdag gis; N,L: de dag gis (omitting la bdag). d) P: sgyur. e) N,L: tshogs pa daṅ. f) P,N,D,L: btab ste.

[5.13] 'jam dpal bcom ldan 'das de bźin gśegs pa dgra bcom pa yaṅ dag par rdzogs pa'i saṅs rgyas sman gyi bla bai ḍū rya'i 'od[a] de sṅon byaṅ chub sems dpa'i spyad pa spyod pa na smon lam chen po bcu gñis po de dag[1] btab par gyur to /

1) P: 'di dag.

a) P,N,L: add 'od kyi rgyal po.

[6] 'jam dpal de bźin gśegs pa[a] sman gyi bla bai ḍū rya'i 'od[b] de'i smon lam gaṅ yin pa daṅ / saṅs rgyas kyi źiṅ gi yon tan bkod pa[1,c] gaṅ yin pa(1,c de ni bskal pa 'am / bskal pa las lhag par yaṅ zad par byar mi nus so / saṅs rgyas kyi źiṅ de ni śin tu yoṅs su dag pa[2] ste / rdo daṅ / gseg[d] ma daṅ / gyo mo med pa / 'dod pa'i skyon med pa / ṅan soṅ daṅ sdug bsṅal gyi sgra med pa / bud med kyi dṅos po med pa / sa[e] daṅ / rtsig[f] pa daṅ / ra ba daṅ / rta babs daṅ / skar khuṅ gi dra ba daṅ / ba gam ni bai ḍū rya'i raṅ bźin can / pu śu ni[g] rin po che sna bdun gyi raṅ bźin can te[3] / 'jig rten gyi khams bde ba can ci 'dra ba de bźin du[h] / 'jig rten gyi khams bai ḍū ryar snaṅ[4,i] ba'i saṅs rgyas kyi źiṅ gi yon tan bkod pa yaṅ de daṅ[5,j] 'dra'o / 'jig rten gyi khams de na byaṅ chub sems dpa' 'graṅs med dpag tu med pa de dag gi naṅ na / byaṅ chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po gtso bo gñis yod de / gcig gi miṅ ni ñi ma ltar rnam par snaṅ byed ces bya / gñis pa'i miṅ ni zla ba ltar rnam par snaṅ byed ces

bya / de dag ni bcom ldan 'das de bźin gśegs pa sman gyi bla bai ḍū rya'i 'od[k] de'i dam pa'i chos kyi mdzod 'dzin pa'o / 'jam dpal de lta bas na dad[6] pa'i rigs kyi bu 'am / rigs kyi bu mos saṅs rgyas kyi źiṅ der skye bar smon lam thob cig[L] /

1)(1 P: gad yin pa; L: omits gaṅ yin pa. 2) P: dag ba. 3) P: can de. 4) P: bai dū rya' snaṅ. 5) P: omits daṅ. 6) P: daṅ.

a) N,L: insert dgra bcom pa yaṅ dag par rdzogs pa'i saṅs rgyas. b) N,D,L: insert kyi rgyal po. c)(c N: yin pa, omitting gaṅ. d) P: bseg. e) P: sa rde; D,L: sa rdo. f) P: brtsig. g) P: ka(?) su ni; N,L: sa gźi ni; D: ka źu ni. h) P,D: bźin du, instead of de bźin du. i) P: bai dū rya'i snaṅ. j) P: omits daṅ. k) N,L: add kyi rgyal po. L) N: śig.

[7] yaṅ bcom ldan 'das kyis 'jam dpal gźon nur gyur pa la bka' stsal pa / 'jam dpal sems can so so'i skye bo gaṅ dag dge ba daṅ mi dge ba mi śes pa dag yod de / de dag ni chags pa'i[a] zil gyis non pa / sbyin pa daṅ sbyin pa'i 'bras bu rnam par[1] smin pa mi śes pa'o / de dag ni byis pa glen pa dad pa'i dbaṅ po daṅ bral ba / nor sog ciṅ[2,b] / sruṅ ba[3,c] la mṅon par brtson gyi / sbyin pa yaṅ dag par 'gyed pa la[4,d] de dag gi[e] sems mi 'gro ba ste / sbyin pa'i dus ñe bar gnas pa na raṅ gi lus kyi śa las bcad pa[5,f] bźin du yid mi dga' bar 'gyur ro[6,g] / sems can de dag ni bdag ñid kyaṅ du ma[h] yoṅs su mi spyod na pha ma daṅ / chuṅ ma daṅ / bu daṅ / bu mo la mi[i] ster ba lta[j] smos kyaṅ ci dgos / bran pho[7,k] daṅ / bran mo daṅ / las byed pa rnams la[8] lta smos[L] kyaṅ ci dgos / gźan sloṅ ba rnams la[m] lta smos kyaṅ ci dgos / sems can de lta bu de dag ni 'di nas śi 'phos nas[9] yi dags[10,n] kyi 'jig rten du skye bar 'gyur[11,o] / yaṅ na dud 'gro'i skye gnas su[12] skye bar 'gyur ro / de la gaṅ dag sṅon mir gyur pa na / bcom ldan 'das de bźin gśegs pa sman gyi bla bai ḍū rya'i 'od[p] de'i[q] mtshan thos par gyur pa de dag ni gśin rje'i 'jig rten na gnas kyaṅ ruṅ / dud 'gro'i skye gnas na gnas kyaṅ ruṅ ste / der de bźin gśegs pa de'i mtshan mṅon du 'gyur źiṅ dran r)ma thag pa tsam gyis(r

de nas śi 'phos nas yaṅ mi'i 'jig rten du skye bar 'gyur tshe rabs dran par 'gyur ro[13] / ṅan 'gro'i 'jigs pas skrag nas yaṅ 'dod pa'i yon tan dag don du mi[14] gñer ba daṅ / sbyin pa la mṅon par dga' ba daṅ / sbyin pa'i bsṅags[15] pa brjod pa daṅ / bdog pa thams cad yoṅs su gtoṅ bar gyur te[16] / rim gyis[s] raṅ gi mgo daṅ / lag pa daṅ / rkaṅ pa daṅ / mig daṅ / śa daṅ / khrag kyaṅ sloṅ ba rnams la rab tu sbyin par 'gyur na / nor gyi phuṅ po gźan lta smos[t] kyaṅ ci dgos /

[1] N,L: rnam pa. [2] P: brtsogs śiṅ; L: gsog ciṅ. [3] P,L: bsruṅ ba. [4] P: bkod pa la. [5] P: gcod pa; N: 'bad pa. [6] N: 'gyur'o. [7] N: bran po. [8] P: omits la. [9] P: śi 'phos na. [10] L: dvags. [11] P,L: 'gyur ro. [12] N: gnasu. [13] N: 'gyur. [14] P: ma. [15] P: sṅags. [16] N,L: 'gyur te.

[a] N,D,L: chags pas. [b] P: brtsogs śiṅ; D: sogs śiṅ; L: bsog śiṅ. [c] P,D,L: bsruṅ. [d] P: god pa la. [e] P: gis; N,L: omit gi. [f] P: gcad. [g] P,N,D,L: 'gyur pa'o. [h] N,L: du mas. [i] N: mi omitted. [j] L: la for lta. [k] N: bran po. [l] P: mos. [m] P: la omitted. [n] L: dvags. [o] P,D: 'gyur ro; N,L: 'gyur te. [p] N,L: insert kyi rgyal po. [q] N: de for de'i. [r] (r P,D: have instead ma thag tu rim gyis. [s] N,L: rims gyis. [t] P: mos.

[8] 'jam dpal gźan yaṅ sems can gaṅ dag de bźin gśegs pa rnams kyi bslab pa'i gnas 'jig pa[a] dag yod de[1] / de dag tshul khrims log par źugs śiṅ lta ba log par źugs nas / gaṅ dag tshul khrims daṅ ldan pa de dag ni tshul khrims[b] sruṅ[2,c] gi maṅ du thos pa yoṅs su mi tshol[3] te / de bźin gśegs pas gsuṅs pa'i mdo sde rnams kyi don zab mo mi śes / gaṅ dag maṅ du thos pa de[4] dag ni lhag pa'i ṅa rgyal can du gyur[d] te / ṅa rgyal gyis[e] non pas gźan dag la[f] phrag dog byed ciṅ dam pa'i chos la dbaṅ za bar 'gyur / spoṅ[g] bar 'gyur ro[5] / mi blun po de lta bu[h] de dag ni bdud kyi[6] phyogs[i] pa ste / bdag kyaṅ lam ṅan par źugs la sems can gźan[j] bye[k] ba khrag khrig brgya stoṅ du ma dag kyaṅ g-yaṅ sa chen por lhuṅ[7,l] bar byed pa'o / sems can de lta bu de dag ni sems can dmyal ba[m] mi bzad par 'gro bar 'gyur ro[8] / gaṅ dag sṅon mir gyur pa na bcom ldan 'das de bźin gśegs pa[n] sman gyi bla bai dū rya'i 'od de'i mtshan thos par gyur pa[9] de dag ni sems can dmyal ba na gnas kyaṅ der saṅs rgyas kyi mthus de bźin

gśegs pa de'i mtshan mṅon du 'gyur te / de dag de nas śi 'phos nas yaṅ mi'i 'jig rten du skye bar 'gyur / yaṅ dag pa'i lta ba can daṅ / brtson 'grus daṅ ldan pa daṅ / dge ba'i bsam pa can du 'gyur ro[10] / de dag khyim spaṅs te de bźin gśegs pa'i bstan pa la rab tu byuṅ nas mthar gyis[11] byaṅ chub sems dpa'i spyad pa[o] spyod par 'gyur ro[10] //

[1])N: yod. [2])P,L: bsruṅ. [3])L: 'tshol. [4])N: omits de. [5])N: omits ro. [6])P: kyis. [7])N,L: ltuṅ. [8])N: omits ro. [9])P: gyur ba. [10])N: 'gyuro; not noted hereafter. [11])N: mthar gyi.

[a])P,N,D,L: 'dzin pa for 'jig pa. [b])N,D,L: after tshul khrims add bsam. [c])P,D,L: bsruṅ. [d])D: 'gyur. [e])N,L: add ni after ṅa rgyal gyis. [f])N: omits la. [g])N: spos. [h])N,L: omit de lta bu. [i])L: rtogs. [j])N,D,L: insert gaṅ after gźan. [k])P: bya. [l])P: ltuṅ. [m])L: ṅa rgyal ba for dmyal ba. [n])N,L: add dgra bcom pa yaṅ dag par rdzogs pa'i saṅs rgyas...'od kyi rgyal po. [o])P: dpa' spyad.

[9] 'jam dpal gźan yaṅ sems can gaṅ dag bdag gi[1] bsṅags[2,a] pa brjod ciṅ phrag dog gis gźan dag la[3] mi sñan par[b] brjod[4] pa yod de / bdag la bstod ciṅ gźan la smod pa'i sems can de dag ṅan soṅ gsum po dag tu lo stoṅ phrag maṅ por sdug bsṅal myoṅ bar 'gyur ro / de dag lo stoṅ phrag du ma 'das nas de nas śi 'phos nas ba laṅ daṅ / rta daṅ / rṅa mo daṅ / boṅ bu la sogs pa[c] dud 'gro'i skye gnas rnams su skye bar 'gyur[d] / lcug lcag[5] daṅ / dbyug[6,e] lcag rnams kyis[7] brdeg pa[8] daṅ / bkres pa daṅ / skom pas lus ñen pa daṅ / khal chen po bkal[f] te lam du 'gro bar 'gyur ro[9] / gal te brgya[g] la [h)]mi'i skye ba rñed na[(h] yaṅ rtag tu rigs dma' ba rnams kyi naṅ du skye bar 'gyur ro[10,i] / bran du[11] 'gyur ro / gaṅ dag sṅon mir gyur pa na bcom ldan 'das de bźin gśegs pa[j] sman gyi bla baiḍū rya'i 'od de'i mtshan thos par gyur pa / de dag ni[12] dge ba'i rtsa ba[13] des sdug bsṅal thams cad las yoṅs su thar bar 'gyur / dbaṅ po rno bar 'gyur / mkhas pa daṅ / gsal ba daṅ / yid gźuṅs[k] pa daṅ / dge ba yoṅs su btsal[14,l] ba la mṅon par brtson[15] pa daṅ / rtag tu dge ba'i bśes[m] gñen daṅ 'grogs pa rñed par 'gyur / bdud kyi źags pa gcod pa daṅ / ma rig pa'i

sgo ṅa'i sbubs gcog[n] pa daṅ / ñon moṅs pa'i chu kluṅ[16] skems par 'gyur / skye ba daṅ / rga śi daṅ / mya ṅan daṅ / smre sṅags 'don pa daṅ / sdug bsṅal ba daṅ / yid mi bde ba daṅ / 'khrug[o] pa rnams las yoṅs su thar bar 'gyur ro[17] //

1)N: bdag gis. 2)P: sṅags. 3)P: dag 'ba or dga' ba. 4)D: rjod. 5)N: lcu lcag. 6)P,N: dbyig. 7)N: rnams kyi. 8)P: ba. 9)N: 'gyur. 10)P,N,L: 'gyur. 11)N,L: bran tu. 12)P: de dag na. 13)L: rtsa pa. 14)P: brtsal; N: stsal. 15)N: rtson. 16)P: rluṅ. 17)N: 'gyur.

a)N: bsṅag. b)P,N,D,L: mi sñan pa. c)P: omits pa. d)N: 'gyur ro. e)P: dbyig. f)P: bskal. g)N: rgya. h)(hP,N,D,L: mi'i rñed pa rñed pa na. i)P,N,D,L: 'gyur. j)N,L: add dgra bcom pa yaṅ dag par rdzogs pa'i saṅs rgyas... 'od kyi rgyal po; D: adds dgra bcom, etc., but not 'od kyi rgyal po. k)N: bźuṅs. l)L: bcol. m)N: gśes. n)L: cog. o)N,L: 'khrugs.

[10] 'jam dpal gźan yaṅ sems can gaṅ dag[1] phra ma la mṅon par dga' źiṅ sems can gaṅ[a] dag phan tshun 'thab pa[2] daṅ / rtsod pa daṅ / b)'gyed par byed du(b 'jug pa dag[c] yod de[3] / sems can de[4] dag rnam par[d] rtsod pa'i sems su[5] gyur pas[6] lus daṅ ṅag daṅ / yid kyis[7] mi dge ba rnam pa[8] sna tshogs mṅon par 'du byed do // gcig la gcig phan pa ma yin pa 'dod ciṅ rtag tu phan tshun gnod par bya ba'i phyir brtson te / de dag nags tshal gyi lha daṅ / śiṅ gi lha daṅ / ri'i lha 'gugs[9,e] par byed / dur khrod rnams su[10] 'byuṅ po tha dad pa dag 'gugs[11,e] par byed / dud 'gro'i skye gnas su soṅ ba'i srog chags rnams kyi srog gcod ciṅ śa daṅ khrag za ba'i gnod sbyin daṅ / srin po rnams mchod par byed de[12] / dgra bo de'i miṅ nas brjod pa[f] 'am / gzugs byas nas der rig sṅags drag po sgrub[13] ciṅ / byad stems[14,g] daṅ / ro laṅs kyi sbyor bas srog gi bar chad bya ba daṅ / lus rnam par gźig par 'dod pa la gaṅ dag gis bcom ldan 'das de bźin gśegs pa sman gyi bla bai dū rya'i 'od kyi rgyal po[15,h] de'i mtshan thos par gyur pa[16] de dag la gaṅ gis kyaṅ bar chad bya bar[17] mi nus te / de dag phan tshun byams pa'i sems daṅ / phan pa'i sems daṅ / gnod pa'i

sems[18,i] med pa'i sems su[5] gnas par 'gyur / raṅ raṅ gi bdog pas chog śes par 'gyur ro[19] //

1)P,N,L: sems can dag. 2)L: pha. 3)N: yode. 4)N: omits de. 5)N: semsu. 6)N: bas. 7)N: gyis. 8)N,L: omit rnam pa. 9)P: 'gug. 10)N: rnamsu. 11)P: 'gug. 12)N: byede. 13)P,L: bsgrub. 14)P: stem. 15)Note the addition of rgyal po to the name. It is found in all editions. 16)N: ba. 17)N: bya ba. 18)N,L: gnod sems. 19)N: 'gyuro.

a)P,N: omit gaṅ. b)(bP: 'gyed bur byed tu. c)N,L: omit dag. d)P: rnam pa. e)P: 'gug. f)P: omits pa. g)N: stem. h)D: 'od de'i mtshan, omitting kyi rgyal po. i)P,N,D,L: gnod sems.

[11] 'jam dpal gźan yaṅ 'khor bźi po dge sloṅ daṅ / dge sloṅ ma daṅ / dge bsñen[1] daṅ / dge bsñen ma de dag daṅ / gźan yaṅ dad pa'i rigs kyi bu 'am / rigs kyi bu mo gaṅ dag yan lag brgyad daṅ ldan pa'i bsñen gnas la ñe bar gnas te[a] / lo gcig gam / zla ba gsum du bslab pa'i gźi[b] rnams 'dzin ciṅ gaṅ dag gis[2,c] bsam pas bdag gis[3,d] dge ba'i rtsa ba 'dis nub phyogs gaṅ na[4] de bźin gśegs pa tshe dpag med bźugs pa'i 'jig rten gyi khams bde ba can du skye bar śog śig[5,e] ces smon lam de lta bu[f] btab pa[6] dag las / gaṅ dag gis bcom ldan 'das de bźin gśegs pa sman gyi bla bai ḍū rya'i 'od[g] de'i mtshan thos par gyur pa de dag 'chi ba'i dus kyi tshe byaṅ chub sems dpa' brgyad rdzu 'phrul gyis lhags nas ston par[7] 'gyur te / de dag der padma[8] tshon kha[9] dog sna tshogs rnams las[10,h] rdzus[11,i] te skye bar 'gyur ro // gaṅ la la dag lha'i 'jig rten du skye bar 'gyur ba de dag ni der skyes nas sṅon gyi dge ba'i rtsa ba de zad par mi 'gyur źiṅ ṅan 'gror 'gro bar mi 'gyur ro // de nas śi 'phos nas kyaṅ mi'i 'jig rten 'dir gliṅ bźi pa'i dbaṅ phyug 'khor los sgyur[12,j] ba'i rgyal por gyur te / sems can bye ba khrag khrig brgya stoṅ[k] du ma[l] dge ba bcu'i las kyi lam la 'god par[m] 'gyur ro // gźan du na yaṅ rgyal rigs śiṅ sā la[13,n] chen po lta bu'i khyim dag tu skye bar 'gyur / bram ze śiṅ sā la[13,n] chen po lta bu'i khyim dag daṅ / khyim bdag śiṅ sā la[13,n] chen po lta bu'i khyim dag daṅ / nor daṅ 'bru daṅ / mdzod[14] daṅ / baṅ[15]

ba maṅ[16] po 'byor pa'i[17] khyim dag tu skye bar 'gyur te / gzugs phun sum tshogs pa daṅ / dbaṅ phyug phun sum tshogs[o] pa daṅ / g-yog phun sum tshogs pa daṅ / dpa' ba[18,p] daṅ / rtul[19] phod pa daṅ / tshan po che chen po'i[20] stobs kyi[q] śugs daṅ ldan par 'gyur ro //

1) P: dge sñen. 2) N: gaṅ dag gi. 3) P,D: bdag gi. 4) L: gźan instead of gaṅ na. 5) N: śog cig. 6) P: btab ba. 7) P: bar. 8) P: pad ma. 9) P: tshon pa (?). 10) P: rnams la. 11) N: brdzus. 12) P,N,L: bsgyur. 13) P,N: sa la. 14) P: mjod. 15) N: bad. 16) N: mad. 17) P: 'byor ba'i. 18) N: dpa' pa. 19) N,L: brtul. 20) N,L: tshan po chen po'i.

a) L: gnas la. b) N,L: bslab pa'i gnas. c) P,D: gaṅ dag gi. d) P,N,D,L: bdag gi. e) L: cig. f) N: adds dag. g) N,L: add kyi rgyal po. h) P,N,D,L: rnams la. i) N,L: brdzus. j) P,N,L: bsgyur. k) P,D,L: stoṅ phrag. L) P,N,D,L: du ma dag. m) P: bkod par. n) P,N: sa la. o) L: omits tshogs. p) P: dpa' bo. q) N,L: stobs kyis.

[12] bud med gaṅ gis de bźin gśegs pa de'i mtshan thos śiṅ bzuṅ ba de'i bud med kyi dṅos po de tha ma[a] yin par śes par bya'o //

a) D: tha ma pa.

[13] de nas bcom ldan 'das la 'jam dpal gźon nur gyur pas 'di skad ces gsol to // bcom ldan 'das slad ma'i tshe[a] slad ma'i dus na / gaṅ dag mdo 'di 'chaṅ ba daṅ / klog pa daṅ / 'chad[1] pa daṅ / gźan dag la rgya cher yaṅ dag par ston pa daṅ / yi ger 'dri ba daṅ / yi ger 'drir[b] stsol ba daṅ / glegs bam la bris te me tog daṅ / bdug pa daṅ / spos daṅ[c] / phreṅ ba daṅ / byug pa daṅ / gdugs daṅ / rgyal mtshan rnams kyis bkur sti bgyid pa'i[2] dad pa'i[3] rigs kyi bu 'am / rigs kyi bu mo de dag la bdag gis bcom ldan 'das de bźin gśegs pa sman gyi bla bai ḍū rya'i 'od de'i mtshan rnam pa sna tshogs[4] su bsgrag[d] par[5] bgyi'o // tha na rmi lam du yaṅ[e] saṅs rgyas kyi mtshan rna lam du ñe bar bsgrag[f] par bgyi'o // tshon sna lṅa pa'i[6] gos[7] rnams kyis dkris te phyogs gtsaṅ mar bźag[g] na / gaṅ na mdo sde 'di[8] gnas pa[h] der rgyal po chen po bźi 'khor daṅ bcas pa daṅ / lha bye ba khrag khrig brgya stoṅ gźan yaṅ mchi bar[9] 'gyur ro // gaṅ dag bcom ldan 'das de

bźin gśegs pa sman gyi bla[i] bai ḍū rya'i 'od[10,j] de'i mtshan daṅ / sṅon gyi smon lam gyi khyad par rgyas pa'i[k] mdo 'di 'dzin pa de dag dus ma lags par 'gum par mi 'gyur / sus kyaṅ mdaṅs 'phrog par mi nus te / phrogs na yaṅ slar 'phrog[11,L] par 'gyur ro //

1) L: 'chaṅ. 2) N: bkur stir bgyi ba'i; L: bkur stir bgyi pa'i. 3) N,L: omit dad pa'i. 4) N: tshogsu. 5) P: bar. 6) P: lṅa na pī (?). 7) N,P: tshon instead of gos. 8) P: 'dir. 9) P: par. 10) N: 'od 'od. 11) P: 'phrogs.

a) N: omits slad ma'i tshe. b) L: 'dri. c) P,D: omit spos daṅ. d) N,L: bsgrags. e) L: 'aṅ. f) P: omits ñe bar and reads bsgrags; N: sgrag. g) P: gźag. h) N,L: insert de daṅ. i) D: omits sman gyi bla. j) N,L: insert kyi rgyal po. k) P: rgyas pa. L) P,N: 'phrogs; D,L: phrogs.

[14] bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa / 'jam dpal / de de bźin / ji skad smras pa[1,a] bźin no // 'jam dpal dad pa'i rigs kyi bu 'am / rigs kyi bu mo gaṅ dag de bźin gśegs pa de la mchod pa byed pa de dag gis de bźin gśegs pa de'i sku[b] gzugs bya[c] / ñin źag bdun du [2,d)] 'phags pa'i yan lag brgyad[(2,d] daṅ ldan pa'i bsñen gnas la ñe bar gnas par bya[3,e] // kha[f] zas gtsaṅ ma bza'[g] źiṅ lus legs par[4] bkrus te / gos bzaṅ po dri ma med pa[5] bgo źiṅ phyogs gtśaṅ mar[h] me tog sna tshogs sil ma[6] bkram pa / spos sna tshogs kyis[i] bdugs[7,j] pa / ras daṅ / gdugs daṅ / rgyal mtshan sna tshogs kyis legs par brgyan[8,k] pa'i sa phyogs su[9] dri ma med pa'i sems daṅ / rñog pa med pa'i sems daṅ / gnod sems med pa'i sems daṅ / byams pa'i sems daṅ / btaṅ[L] sñoms kyi sems daṅ / mñam pa'i sems su[10] bya / rol mo'i sgra daṅ / sil sñan daṅ / glu dbyaṅs blaṅ źiṅ de bźin gśegs pa'i sku gzugs de la bskor bar bya ste[11,m] / de'i sṅon gyi smon lam yaṅ yid la bya źiṅ mdo sde[n] 'di yaṅ bstan na[o] gaṅ bsams[12] pa daṅ / gaṅ smon pa'i bsam pa[p] de thams cad yoṅs su rdzogs par[13] 'gyur te / gal te tshe riṅ bar[14] smon na ni tshe riṅ por 'gyur ro // gal te loṅs spyod[q] daṅ ldan par smon na ni loṅs spyod 'byor par[15,r] 'gyur ro // gal te dbaṅ phyug daṅ ldan par smon na ni tshegs[16] chuṅ ṅus rñed par 'gyur ro // gal te bu 'dod na ni[17] bu

rñed par 'gyur ro // gaṅ dag sdig pa can gyi rmi lam rmis sam / gaṅ du bya khva ta daṅ[18,s] / ltas ṅan pa mthoṅ ṅam[t] / gnas gaṅ du bkra mi śis pa brgya[u] dag gnas par gyur pa la / gaṅ dag bcom ldan 'das de bźin gśegs pa sman gyi bla bai ḍū rya'i 'od[v] de la mchod pa rnam pa sna tshogs kyis bkur sti byed na rmi lam ṅan pa daṅ / ltas ṅan pa daṅ / bkra mi śis pa'i dṅos po thams cad mthoṅ bar mi 'gyur ro // gaṅ dag mes 'jigs pa daṅ / chus 'jigs pa daṅ / [19)]mtshon gyis 'jigs pa daṅ / dug gis 'jigs pa daṅ[(19] g-yaṅ sas[20] 'jigs pa daṅ / glaṅ po che[w] gtum pos 'jigs pa daṅ / seṅ ges 'jigs pa daṅ / stag gis 'jigs pa daṅ / dom daṅ / dred daṅ / sbrul gdug pas 'jigs pa daṅ / sbrul daṅ[21,x] / sdig pa daṅ / rkaṅ lag brgya[y] pas[22] 'jigs pa de dag gis de bźin gśegs pa de la mchod pa byas na 'jigs pa thams cad las[z] yoṅs su thar bar 'gyur ro / gaṅ dag pha rol gyi dmag tshogs kyis 'jigs pa daṅ / rkun pos 'jigs pa daṅ / chom pos 'jigs pa de dag gis kyaṅ[23] de bźin gśegs pa de la mchod pa bya'o //

1) P: ba. 2)(2 N: 'phags pa'i lam lan lag brgyad; L: 'phags pa'i lam yan lag brgyad; cf. Skt.[14]n.10. 3) N,L: bya'o. 4) P: bar. 5) P: ba. 6) N: bsil ma. 7) P,N,L: bdug. 8) N: rgyan. 9) N: phyogsu. 10) N: semsu. 11) P: bskor bar byas te; D: bskor ba byas te; L: bskor ba bya ste. 12) P: bsam. 13) N: bar. 14) N,L: por. 15) P: bar. 16) N,L: tshigs. 17) D: 'dod na na ni. 18) N: bya khva daṅ; L: bya khva da daṅ. 19)(19 N,L: invert the order: dug gis ... mtshon gyis. 20) N: g-yaṅs sas. 21) N: omits sbrul daṅ. 22) P: bas; L: pa'i. 23) N: de dag gi yaṅ; L: de dag gis yaṅ.

a) N,L: after pa insert de de. b) P: omits sku. c) P,N,D,L: byas te. d) N: 'phags pa'i lam yan lag brgyad. e) N: omits gnas par; L: gnas pa bya la. f) L: omits kha. g) N: za. h) P: ma. i) N: kyi. j) P: gdugs; N: bdug pa. k) N: rgyan. l) P: gtaṅ. m) N,D,L: bskor ba bya ste. n) P: omits sde. o) N: ston na. p) P,D: insert daṅ; N: bsams pa. q) N: spyad. r) D,L: bar. s) P,N,D,L: khva daṅ. t) P: ltas ṅan mthoṅ ba 'am; N,D,L: ltas ṅan mthoṅ ṅam. u) P,D: brgyad. v) N,L: insert kyi rgyal po. w) N: ches. x) P,N,D,L: omit sbrul daṅ. y) P,D: brgyad. z) P: omits las.

[15] 'jam dpal gźan yaṅ dad pa'i rigs kyi bu 'am / rigs kyi bu mo gaṅ dag ji srid 'tsho'i bar du dkon mchog[a] gsum la skyabs su[1] 'dzin ciṅ / lha gźan mi 'dzin pa daṅ / gaṅ dag[b] yaṅ bslab pa'i gźi[c] lṅa po dag 'dzin pa daṅ[d] / gaṅ dag bslab pa'i gźi bcu po dag[e] 'dzin pa daṅ / gaṅ dag byaṅ chub sems dpa'i sdom pa bslab pa'i gźi bźi brgya po[f] dag 'dzin pa daṅ / khyim gyi gnas nas byuṅ ba'i[2] dge sloṅ gaṅ dag bslab pa'i gźi[g] ñis brgya lṅa bcu po dag 'dzin pa daṅ / dge sloṅ ma gaṅ dag bslab pa'i gźi lṅa brgya po dag[3,h] 'dzin pa daṅ / gaṅ dag ji ltar yoṅs su bzuṅ ba'i bslab pa'i sdom pa de dag gi naṅ nas bslab pa'i gźi gaṅ yaṅ ruṅ ba źig las[i] ñams par gyur te / ṅan 'gro[j] ṅan soṅ gis 'jigs skrag pa gaṅ dag bcom ldan 'das de bźin gśegs pa sman gyi bla bai ḍū rya'i 'od de la mchod pa rnam pa[k] sna tshogs byed na / de dag[l] la ṅan soṅ gsum gyi sdug bsṅal med par śes par bya'o / bud med gaṅ la la bu btsa' ba'i dus na sdug bsṅal ma ruṅs pa drag po mi bzad pa myoṅ ba des[4] / bcom ldan 'das de bźin gśegs pa sman gyi bla bai ḍū rya'i 'od[m] de la mchod na / de myur du yoṅs su thar bar 'gyur[5,n] / bu yaṅ yan lag yoṅs su tshaṅ bar[o] btsa' źiṅ gzugs bzaṅ ba daṅ / mdzes pa daṅ / blta[6] na sdug pa daṅ / dbaṅ po rno ba daṅ / blo daṅ ldan pa daṅ / nad med ciṅ gnod pa ñuṅ bar 'gyur ro[p] / de la mi ma yin pas mdaṅs 'phrog[q] par mi nus so /

1) N: skyabsu. 2) P: 'byuṅ po'i. 3) N: de dag. 4) N,L: de. 5) N: 'gyuro; L: 'gyur ro. 6) P: lta.

a) N,D,L: omit dkon mchog. b) N,L: omit dag. c) N: bźi. d) N: omits daṅ. e) N: omits dag. f) N: inserts 'di after po. g) N: bźi. h) N: omits dag. i) P: nas instead of źig las. j) N,L: insert daṅ after 'gro. k) N,L: omit rnam pa. l) N: omits dag. m) N,L: add kyi rgyal po. n) L: 'gyur ro. o) N: tshaṅ ba. p) P,L: 'gyur te. q) D: 'phrogs.

[16] de nas bcom ldan 'das kyis tshe daṅ ldan pa kun dga' bo la bka' stsal pa / kun dga' bo gaṅ gi phyir ṅa[1,a] bcom ldan 'das de bźin gśegs pa sman gyi bla bai ḍū rya'i 'od[b] de'i yon tan brjod par khyod dad dam yid ches sam / yaṅ na khyod saṅs rgyas kyi spyod yul zab[c] mo 'di la yid gñis

sam / som ñi 'am / the tshom[2] ża ba med dam / de skad ces bka' stsal pa daṅ[d] / de nas bcom ldan 'das la tshe daṅ ldan pa kun dka' bos 'di skad ces gsol to // btsun pa bcom ldan 'das bdag[3] de bźin gśegs pas gsuṅs pa'i chos rnams la yid gñis sam / som ñi 'am / the tshom[4,e] 'tshal ba ma mchis so // de ci'i slad du źe na / de bźin gśegs pa rnams la sku daṅ / gsuṅ daṅ / thugs kyi kun tu spyod pa yoṅs su ma dag pa mi mṅa' ba'i slad du'o / bcom ldan 'das gdugs daṅ dguṅ zla[f] 'di ltar rdzu 'phrul che źiṅ / 'di ltar mthu che ba[5] 'di gñis ni dog sa la ltuṅ yaṅ gda'[g] / ri'i rgyal po ri rab ni gnas nas 'pho yaṅ gda'i[6] / saṅs rgyas rnams kyi[7] bka' ni gźan du mi 'gyur lags so // btsun pa bcom ldan 'das de lta[h] lags kyis kyaṅ sems can dad pa'i dbaṅ po daṅ bral ba dag mchis te / saṅs rgyas rnams kyi[i] saṅs rgyas kyi spyod yul 'di thos nas[j] / de dag 'di sñam du sems par 'gyur te / de bźin gśegs pa de'i mtshan 'di[8] dran pa tsam gyis ji ltar śin tu yon tan daṅ / phan yon du 'gyur[k] sñam nas de dag mi dad ciṅ yid mi ches te[9] / spoṅ bas[L] yun riṅ por gnod pa daṅ / mi sman pa daṅ / mi bde ba daṅ / log par ltuṅ[m] bar 'gyur ro // bcom ldan 'das kyis bka'[n] stsal pa / kun dga' bo de bźin gśegs pa de'i mtshan su'i rna lam du grag[10,o] par gyur pa de ṅan 'gro ṅan soṅ du 'gro bar 'gyur ba ni gnas med de[11] go skabs ma yin no[12] // kun dga' bo saṅs rgyas rnams kyi[p] saṅs rgyas kyi spyod yul[q] ni yid ches par dka' ba'o[r] // kun dga' bo khyod[13] dad ciṅ yid ches pa gaṅ yin pa de ni de bźin gśegs pa'i mthu yin par blta'o // byaṅ chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po skye ba gcig gis thogs pa rnams ma gtogs[s] par 'di ni[t] ñan thos daṅ / raṅ saṅs rgyas thams cad[14] kyi sa ma yin no // kun dga' bo mir 'gyur ba[15] rñed pa ni rñed par dka'o[u] // dkon mchog gsum la dad ciṅ gus pa yaṅ rñed par dka'o // de bźin gśegs pa de'i mtshan thos pa[16] yaṅ rñed par śin tu dka'o // kun dga' bo bcom ldan 'das de bźin gśegs pa sman gyi bla bai ḍū rya'i 'od[v] de'i byaṅ chub sems dpa'i spyod pa ni[17] tshad med do[18] // thabs la[19] mkhas pa yaṅ tshad med do[18] // smon lam gyi khyad par rgyas pa yaṅ tshad med do[18] // ṅa[20,w] de bźin gśegs pa de'i byaṅ chub sems dpa'i spyod pa bskal pa'am / bskal[21] pa las lhag par rgya

cher yaṅ dag par bśad par 'dod kyaṅ bskal pa zad par 'gyur gyi / bcom ldan 'das de bźin gśegs pa sman gyi bla bai ḍū rya'i 'od[x] de'i sṅon gyi smon lam gyi khyad par rgyas pa'i mtha' rtogs par ni[22,y] mi 'gyur ro //

[1]N: omits ṅa. [2]P,N: tsom. [3]N: de dag instead of bdag. [4]N: tsom. [5]P: omits ba. [6]L: gda' yi. [7]L: kyis. [8]P: mtshan ni. [9]N: yid ches śiṅ; L: yid ma ches śiṅ. [10]N,L: grags. [11]N: me de(?). [12]N: yino. [13]N: khyed. [14]N: has rnams kyi in place of thams cad kyi. [15]N: inserts ni after ba and omits it after the following rñed pa. [16]P: thos par. [17]D: yaṅ. [18]N: medo. [19]D: omits la. [20]P: de in place of ṅa. [21]P: skal. [22]N: omits ni.

[a]P: de instead of ṅa. [b]P,N,D,L: add kyi rgyal po. [c]L: zlab. [d]P,N,D,L: omit de skad ces bka' stsal pa daṅ. [e]P: tsom. [f]N,L: ñi ma daṅ zla ba instead of gdugs daṅ dguṅ zla. [g]P: gda'i. [h]N,L: de ltar. [i]P: kyis. [j]P,D: thos na. [k]P: gyur. [L]P: ba. [m]N,L: rnam par ltuṅ instead of log par ltuṅ. [n]P: 'ka'. [o]N,L: grags. [p]P: kyis. [q]N,D,L: have only saṅs rgyas rnams kyi spyod yul. [r]N,L: dka'o. [s]N: btogs. [t]N: ni omitted. [u]P: dka' bo. [v]N,L: add kyi rgyal po. [w]P: de for ṅa. [x]P,D,L: add kyi rgyal po. [y]P,D: omit ni; N: rtog for rtogs.

[17] yaṅ de'i tshe 'khor de'i naṅ nas byaṅ chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po skyabs[1,a] grol źes bya ba stan las laṅs te / bla gos phrag pa gcig tu gzar nas pus mo g-yas pa'i lha ṅa sa la btsugs te[b] / bcom ldan 'das ga la ba de[2] logs su thal mo sbyar ba btud nas / bcom ldan 'das la 'di skad ces gsol to // bstun pa bcom ldan 'das slad ma'i tshe / slad ma'i dus na / sems can bro nad sna tshogs kyis[c] yoṅs su gzir te / yun riṅ po'i bro nad kyis lus kyi śa basśiṅ[d] / bkres pa daṅ skom pas gre ba daṅ / mchu ni skams[3] / 'gum pa la ni mṅon[e] du phyogs / mdza' bśes[f] daṅ / ñe du daṅ snag gi gñen mtshams ṅu[4] ba rnams kyis ni bskor / phyogs rnams ni mun par mthoṅ / gśin rje'i mi rnams kyis ni[g] draṅs[5] te / de'i lus 'di na ñal yaṅ rnam par śes pa chos kyi rgyal po gśin rje'i mdun du khrid ciṅ / mi de daṅ lhan[h] cig skyes pa'i lha slad bźin 'braṅ ba gaṅ lags pa des ni[6] des dge ba daṅ[i] / mi dge ba[j] bgyis pa de[k] thams cad legs par yi ger[7] bris nas chos kyi rgyal po gśin rje la phul ba daṅ / chos kyi rgyal po gśin rjes de la dris śiṅ brtags[L] nas dge ba'am / mi dge ba ji ltar[m] bgyis pa de bźin

dū bsgo ba las[8,n] / gaṅ dag nad pa de'i don du bcom ldan 'das de bźin gśegs pa sman gyi bla bai ḍū rya'i 'od[o] de la skyabs su[9] mchi[p] źiṅ 'di 'dra ba'i sbyor bas mchod pa bgyid[10,q] na / de'i rnam par śes pa slar ldog ciṅ rmi lam rmis pa bźin du bdag ñid kyis[11,r] 'tshal ba'i gnas der mchis te[12] / yaṅ na ni gdugs bdun / yaṅ na ni gdugs ñi śu rtsa gcig / yaṅ na ni gdugs sum cu[13] rtsa lṅa / yaṅ na ni gdugs bźi bcu rtsa dgu la / de'i rnam par śes pa slar ldog ciṅ dran pa rñed la / de[s] dge la daṅ / mi dge ba'i las kyi rnam par smin pa bdag ñid kyi mṅon sum du 'gyur te[t] srog gi slad du yaṅ / sdig pa'i las mi bgyid do[14] // de lta lags pas[15] dad pa'i rigs kyi bu 'am / rigs kyi bu mo de bźin gśegs pa de la mchod par bgyi'o //

[1]N: bskyab. [2]P,N,L: der. [3]N: bskams. [4]N: du for nu. [5]P: drads. [6]N: omits des ni. [7]N,L: yi ge la. [8]P: la. [9]N: skyabsu. [10]L: bgyi. [11]N,L: kyi. [12]N,L: mchi ste. [13]P: sum bcu. [14]N: bgyido. [15]N,L: bas.

[a]N: bskyab. [b]N,L: gtsugs te. [c]P,N,D,L: insert lus after kyis. [d]N: bas ba ciṅ. [e]P: sṅon for mṅon. [f]N: 'dza' gśes. [g]P: ni omitted. [h]P: ldan for lhan. [i]P,N,D,L: dge ba'am. [j]N,D,L: mi dge ba'i las. [k]N,L: insert dag. [L]P: rtags. [m]P: ji ltab. [n]P,N,D,L: la. [o]P,N,D,L: insert kyi rgyal po. [p]N: 'chi; D: mchis. [q]P: bgyis; N,L: bgyi. [r]N,L: kyi. [s]D,L: de la for de. [t]N: 'gyur ro.

[18] de nas tshe daṅ ldan pa kun dga' bos / byaṅ chub sems dpa' skyabs[1,a] grol la 'di skad ces smras so[2] / rigs kyi bu / bcom ldan 'das de bźin gśegs pa sman gyi bla bai ḍū rya'i 'od[b] de la / ji ltar mchod par[c] bya / byaṅ chub sems dpa' skyabs[1,a] grol gyis smras pa / btsun pa kun dga' bo gaṅ dag nad chen po las yoṅs su thar bar 'dod pa de dag gis nad pa de'i don du[3] / [4)]ñin bdun mtshan bdun[d] du yan lag brgyad daṅ ldan pa'i gso sbyoṅ gi sdom pa blaṅ[e] bar bya'o / dge sloṅ gi dge 'dun la zas daṅ / skom rnams daṅ / yo byad thams cad kyis ci nus su mchod pa daṅ rim gro bya'o / ñin lan gsum mtshan lan gsum du[(4] / bcom ldan 'das de bźin gśegs pa sman gyi bla bai ḍū rya'i 'od[f] de'i mtshan yid la bya'o / mdo 'di lan bźi bcu rtsa dgu

gdon par bya'o / źag bźi bcu rtsa dgur mar me bud par bya'o / sku gzugs bdun bya'o / sku gzugs re re'i spyan snar yaṅ mar me bdun bdun gźag[5,g] go / mar me re re'i tshad kyaṅ śiṅ[6] rta'i 'phaṅ lo tsam du byas te[h] / ci nas kyaṅ źag bźi bcu rtsa dgur mar me mi zad par bya'o / tshon sna lṅa pa'i[7] ba dan bźi bcu rtsa dgu las lhag par bya'o //

[1)]N: bskyab. [2)]N: smraso. [3)]P: nad chen po de'i don du. [4)]([4]Both N and L omit the passage beginning ñin bdun mtshan bdun du ... and ending ... rim gro bya'o. After ... nad pa de'i don du N has ñin lan gsum mtshan lan gsum du which is what P and D have immediately following the passage omitted in N. L, on the other hand, following rim gro bya'o has ñin lan bdun mtshan lan bdun du. [5)]N: bźag. [6)]D: śeṅ. [7)]P: lṅa'i.

[a)]N: bskyab. [b)]P,N,D,L: kyi rgyal po. [c)]P: pa. [d)]D: ñin lan bdun mtshan lan bdun. [e)]P: len for blaṅ. [f)]P,N,D,L: insert kyi rgyal po. [g)]P,N,D,L: bźag. [h)]P,N: bya ste.

[19] btsun pa kun dga' bo gźan yaṅ rgyal po rgyal rigs spyi bo nas dbaṅ bskur ba rnams la / nad kyi[1] gnod pa 'am / raṅ gi dmag tshogs sam / pha rol gyi dmag tshogs kyi[2] gnod pa 'am / rgyu skar gyi gnod pa 'am / gza' zla ba'i gnod pa 'am / gza' ñi ma'i gnod pa 'am / dus ma yin pa'i rluṅ daṅ char gyi gnod pa 'am / than pa'i gnod pa yaṅ ruṅ ste / gnod pa daṅ / nad 'go ba daṅ / 'khrug pa źig ñe bar gnas par gyur na / rgyal po rgyal rigs spyi bo nas dbaṅ bskur ba des / sems can thams cad la byams pa'i sems su[3] bya / btson[a] du bzuṅ ba[4] rnams gtaṅ bar[5,b] bya źiṅ goṅ du smos pa bźin du bcom ldan 'das de bźin gśegs pa sman gyi bla bai ḍū rya'i 'od[c] de la[d] de lta bur mchod pa[e] byas na / rgyal po rgyal rigs spyi bo nas dbaṅ bskur ba de'i dge ba'i rtsa ba de daṅ / bcom ldan 'das de bźin gśegs pa[6] sman gyi bla bai ḍū rya'i 'od[f] de'i sṅon gyi smon lam gyi khyad par gyis[7] yul bde ba daṅ / lo legs par 'gyur / rluṅ daṅ char dus su[g] ldaṅ źiṅ lo tog[h] 'grub par 'gyur[8] / yul de na gnas pa'i sems can thams cad kyaṅ nad med pa daṅ / bde ba daṅ[9] / mchog tu dga' ba maṅ bar[i] 'gyur ro / yul der gnod sbyin daṅ / srin po daṅ / 'byuṅ po daṅ / śa za ma ruṅs pas sems can rnams la gtse[j] bar mi 'gyur ro / ltas ṅan pa[k] thams cad mthoṅ bar mi

gyur[L] ro / rgyal po rgyal rigs spyi bo nas dbaṅ bskur ba de'i tshe daṅ / mdog daṅ / stobs daṅ / nad med pa daṅ[10] / dbaṅ phyug rnams mṅon par 'phel bar 'gyur ro //

[1]) P: nad kyis. [2]) N: tshogs kyis. [3]) N: semsu. [4]) P: gzuṅ ba. [5]) P,N: btaṅ bar. [6]) N: omits de bźin gśegs pa. [7]) L: between gyis and yul inserts bde ba daṅ. [8]) N,L: 'gyur ro. [9]) N: omits bde ba daṅ (is L n.7 a false correction of this omission ?). [10]) N: omits nad med pa daṅ.

[a]) P: brtson. [b]) N: btaṅ bar. [c]) P,N,D,L: insert kyi rgyal po. [d]) N: de la omitted. [e]) P,D: par. [f]) P,N,D,L: insert kyi rgyal po. [g]) P: dus du su. [h]) N,L: lo thog. [i]) N: maṅ por. [j]) L: btse. [k]) P: omits pa. [L]) P: 'gyur.

[20] de nas tshe daṅ ldan pa kun dga' bos byaṅ chub sems dpa' skyabs[1,a] grol la 'di skad ces smras so / rigs kyi bu ji ltar na tshe yoṅs su zad nas[b] yaṅ mṅon par skye / byaṅ chub sems dpa' skyabs[a] grol gyis[c] smras pa / btsun pa kun dga' bo dus ma yin par 'chi ba dgu yod par / khyod kyis de bźin gśegs pa las[d] ma thos sam / de'i phyir / sṅags daṅ sman gyi sbyor ba[2] rnams bstan to[e] // sems can nad kyis btab la[3,f] / de nad tshabs mi ches[4] kyaṅ sman daṅ rim gro byed pa daṅ mi ldan nam / yaṅ na sman pa sman ma yin pa[5] byed pa yaṅ yod de / 'di ni dus ma yin par 'chi ba daṅ po'o // dus ma yin par 'chi ba gñis pa[g] ni / gaṅ dag[h] rgyal po'i chad pas 'chi ba'i dus byed pa'o // dus ma yin par 'chi ba gsum pa ni / gaṅ dag ha cai bag med de[i] bag med par gnas pas de dag la mi ma[6] yin pa dag gis mdaṅs 'phrog[7] pa'o // dus ma yin par 'chi ba bźi pa ni / gaṅ dag mes tshig ste[j] / 'chi ba'i dus byed pa'o // dus ma yin par 'chi ba lṅa pa ni / gaṅ dag chus 'chi ba'o[k] // dus ma yin par 'chi ba drug pa ni / gaṅ dag seṅ ge daṅ / stag daṅ / wa daṅ / sbrul daṅ / gcan gzan[8,L] khro bo'i naṅ du chud de[m] 'chi ba'o / dus ma yin par 'chi ba bdun pa ni / gaṅ dag ri kha[n] nas g-yaṅ du lhuṅ ba'o // dus ma yin par 'chi ba brgyad pa ni / gaṅ dag dug daṅ / byad[o] daṅ / ro laṅs kyi sbyor bas gsod pa'o // dus ma yin par 'chi ba dgu pa ni / gaṅ dag zas daṅ skom ma rñed nas bkres pa

daṅ / skom pas ñen te 'chi ba'i dus byed pa'o // mdor na 'di dag ni / de bžin gšegs pas dus ma yin par 'chi ba chen por bstan pa ste / bźan yaṅ dus ma yin par 'chi ba ni graṅs med dpag tu med do //

1)N: bskyab. 2)P: sbyor bar. 3)N,L: btab pa la. 4)L: chas. 5)N: yin par. 6)P: mis. 7)N: 'phreg. 8)P,N,L: gcan zan.

a)N: bskyab. b)P: zad pa nas. c)N: gyi. d)N: la. e)L: bstan te. f)N,L: btab pa la. g)N: gñis pa omitted. h)P,N,D,L: dag omitted. i)N: omits bag med de; L: bag med dam. j)N: te. k)N: 'chi'o. L)P,N,L: gcan zan. m)N: omits de. n)P: ri (ka?). o)P,D: byad stems for byad.

[21] de nas 'khor der gnod sbyin gyi sde dpon chen po bcu gñis 'dus gyur te / gnod sbyin gyi sde dpon chen po ji 'jigs[a] daṅ / gnod sbyin gyi sde dpon chen po rdo rje[1] daṅ / gnod sbyin gyi sde dpon chen po rgyan[2] 'dzin daṅ / gnod sbyin gyi sde dpon chen po gza' 'dzin daṅ / gnod sbyin gyi sde dpon chen po rluṅ daṅ / gnod sbyin gyi sde dpon chen po gnas bcas daṅ / gnod sbyin gyi sde dpon chen po dbaṅ[b] 'dzin daṅ / gnod sbyon gyi sde dpon chen po btuṅ 'dzin[c] daṅ / gnod sbyin gyi sde dpon chen po smra 'dzin daṅ / gnod sbyin gyi sde dpon chen po bsam 'dzin daṅ / gnod sbyin gyi sde dpon chen po g-yo ba 'dzin daṅ / gnod sbyin gyi sde dpon chen po rdzogs byed de / gnod sbyin gyi sde dpon chen po bcu gñis po de dag go // gnod sbyin gyi sde dpon chen po re re la[3] yaṅ / g-yog gnod sbyin bdun 'bum bdun 'bum yod pa ste / de dag gis tshig gcig tu bcom ldan 'das la 'di skad ces gsol to // [d]saṅs rgyas kyi mthus bdag cag gis / bcom ldan 'das de bžin gšegs pa sman gyi bla bai ḍū rya'i 'od[e] de'i mtshan thos te / bdag cag la yaṅ[4] ṅan 'gror mchi[f] ba'i 'jigs pa 'byuṅ bar mi 'gyur ro / des na[5] bdag cag lhan cig tu mthun[6,g] par ji srid 'tsho'i bar du / saṅs rgyas la skyabs su mchi'o / chos la skyabs su mchi'o / dge 'dun la skyabs su mchi'o // sems can thams cad kyi don daṅ / sman pa daṅ / bde ba'i slad du spro bar bgyi'o / bye brag tu ni groṅ ṅam / groṅ khyer ram / groṅ rdal lam / dgon pa'i gnas gaṅ na mdo sde 'di spyod pa daṅ / gaṅ na[7,h] bcom ldan 'das de bžin gšegs pa sman gyi bla bai ḍū rya'i 'od[i] de'i mtshan 'chaṅ ba daṅ /

mchod pa daṅ / rim gro bgyid pa'i sems can de dag la bdag cag gis[j]

bsruṅ[8,k] bar bgyi[L] / yoṅs su bskyaṅ[m] bar bgyi / gnod pa thams cad las

yoṅs su thar bar bgyi / bsam pa thams cad yoṅs su rdzogs par bgyi'o /

de nas bcom ldan 'das kyis gnod sbyin gyi sde dpon chen po de dag la /

legs so źes bya ba byin te[n] / gnod sbyin gyi sde dpon chen po dag gaṅ gi

phyir khyed[o] / bcom ldan 'das de bźin gśegs pa sman gyi bla bai ḍū rya'i

'od[p] de la byas pa gzo źiṅ rjes su dran la / sems can thams cad la[9] phan

pa'i phyir źugs pa legs so legs so /

[1]D: rdo rdze? [2]N: rgya. [3]N: omits la. [4]N,L: 'aṅ. [5]N,L: de nas. [6]N: 'thun. [7]P: omits na. [8]N:sruṅ. [9]N: omits thams cad.

a) P,D: ci 'jigs; N,L: omit ji 'jigs. [b]D: dpaṅ. [c]L: omits btuṅ 'dzin. [d]N,D,L: insert bcom ldan 'das. [e]P,D,L: insert kyi rgyal po. [f]P: 'chi. [g]P,N: 'thun. [h]P: omits na. [i]P,N,D,L: insert kyi rgyal po. [j]N: bdag gis. [k]N: sruṅ. [L]P: bgyi'o. [m]N,L: bskyab. [n]P,D: gnaṅ ste for byin te. [o]P,N,D,L: khyod. [p]P,N,D,L: insert kyi rgyal po.

[22] de nas tshe daṅ ldan pa kun dga' bo stan las laṅs te / bla gos phrag pa gcig tu gzar nas / pus mo g-yas pa'i lha ṅa sa la btsugs te / bcom ldan 'das ga la ba de logs su thal mo sbyar ba[1] btud nas / bcom ldan 'das la 'di skad ces gsol to // bcom ldan 'das chos kyi rnam graṅs 'di'i miṅ ci lags / 'di ji ltar gzuṅ[2] bar bgyi / bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa / kun dga' bo de'i phyir / chos kyi rnam graṅs 'di de bźin gśegs pa sman gyi bla bai ḍū rya'i 'od kyi sṅon gyi smon lam gyi khyad par rgyas pa źes[3] bya bar[4] zuṅ[5] śig / byaṅ chub sems dpa' lag na rdo rjes dam bcas pa źes[3] bya bar yaṅ zuṅ[6] śig / las kyi sgrib pa thams cad rnam par sbyoṅ źiṅ / re ba thams cad yoṅs su skoṅ ba źes[3] bya bar yaṅ zuṅ[6] śig / gnod sbyin gyi sde dpon chen po bcu gñis kyis dam bcas pa źes bya bar yaṅ zuṅ[6] śig //

[1]D: pa. [2]N: bzuṅ. [3]N: ces. [4]D: inserts yaṅ. [5]N: bzuṅ; L: zuṅs. [6]L: zuṅs.

[23] bcom ldan 'das kyis[1] de skad ces bka' stsal nas / 'jam dpal gźon nur gyur pa daṅ / byaṅ chub sems dpa' de dag daṅ / gsaṅ ba pa'i[2]

bdag po lag na rdo rje daṅ / thams cad daṅ ldan pa'i 'khor de dag daṅ / lha daṅ / mi daṅ / lha ma yin daṅ / dri zar bcas pa'i 'jig rten yi[3] raṅs te / bcom ldan 'das kyis gsuṅs pa la mṅon par bstod do //

1) L: gyis. 2) N,L: gsaṅ ba'i. 3) P: yid.

[24] 'phags pa bcom ldan 'das sman gyi bla bai ḍū rya'i 'od kyi sṅon gyi smon lam gyi khyad par rgyas pa źes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo rdzogs so //

rgya gar gyi mkhan po dzi na mi tra daṅ / dā na[1] śī la daṅ źu[2] chen gyi lo tstsha ba bande[3] ye śes sde la sogs pas [4)]bsgyur ciṅ źus te[(4] / skad gsar chad[5] kyis kyaṅ bcos nas[6] gtan la phab pa[7] /

1) P: dā nā. 2) L: źus. 3) P: ban de; N: ban dhe. 4)(4 N: źus śiṅ bsgyur ha. 5) N,L: bcad. 6) N: śiṅ. 7) D: gtan la la 'pa(?).

THE BHAIṢAJYAGURU-SŪTRA

AND

THE BUDDHISM OF GILGIT

*

TRANSLATION AND NOTES

"La philologie indienne, à peine centenaire, est déjà pavée de dogmes"

Louis de La Vallée Poussin.

"Occasionally one is so fascinated by etymological discussions that one forgets that words have not only an etymology but also a history and that the latter may often be more important for the student of Religion. The question in fact is: what do certain words and concepts mean to specific people at specific times ?"

R.J. Zwi Werblowsky.

I. More Notes On and Towards a Methodology.

Undoubtedly one of the major problems in the study of Indian Buddhism is the fact that it confronts an enormous mass of primary sources - both in Indian languages and in translations - without having any very reliable means of arranging them in chronological sequences. Out of this arises the situation, by no means rare, that in modern studies of almost any given topic textual sources which might in fact differ in age by hundreds of years and may never have been available at any one time to any one individual or 'community' are drawn together and used to establish some *thing* called "the Buddhist" conception of 'purity', or 'The Mahāyāna' conception of 'salvation'. 'Conceptions' thus established are open to at least one devastating criticism: they are complete abstractions with no demonstrable connection with historical reality, with time or place. Even if caution dictates that the 'results' of such studies be presented as 'The, or even A Theravādin Conception of Purity', the critic may legitimately ask which Theravadins and where and when. And if passages cited to establish the conception are taken from the five Nikāyas, as we now have them, that same critic can justifiably ask for a demonstration showing that the hypothetical holders of that conception could have had access to *all* the sources cited.

There are a number of ways of avoiding these questions or at least ameliorating their impact - temporarily. But, given the nature of our sources, there are very few occasions when they can be confronted directly. And it is just here, I think, that the discovery of the Gilgit manuscripts takes on its greatest significance. This discovery has in fact provided us with a situation where we know perhaps for the first time that a certain number of texts were all available at the same time at the same place to an actual community. Thus, in the same way that this collection provides an ideal situation for a definite periodization of the grammar and language of Mahāyāna sūtra literature, so too it provides that same opportunity for a definite periodization of the ideas and practices which are generally lumped together under the almost meaningless abstraction 'Mahāyāna Buddhism'. It allows us the opportunity to see, to reconstruct what Buddhism' could or would have been in the 5th-6th century in an actual 'Indian' community.

(It should be noted that the exact date of the Gilgit manuscripts has yet to be determined. There are two kinds of evidence, paleographic and 'historical'. The latter consists primarily of the names of several kings which occur in the colophons of our manuscripts, one of which also seems to occur in an inscription from Gilgit. Historians have not yet been able to settle the problems associated with these kings, although the inscriptions from the Gilgit region promised by Fussman (*JA* 265 (1977) 39 n.59) might hopefully throw some light on these problems. On the basis of the available evidence the Gilgit collection - and by implication the 'community' - has been dated as either early 5th century, or 5th-6th century, or 6th-7th century. For references see above p.4 and *IIJ* 19 (1977) 202 n.37. I use the 5th-6th century for convenience only, without accepting it as established.)

This 'reconstruction' of the 'Buddhism of Gilgit' in the 5th-6th century on the basis of the literary sources *known* to have been available there could, of course, proceed in any number of ways. But since any attempted reconstruction would be, in effect, an attempt to discover what the term 'Buddhism' could have or would have meant or included at that time and that place, it would require that all presuppositions regarding what 'Buddhism' *is* be set aside. This in turn would require that the defining characteristics must come from the Gilgit sources themselves, that the sources themselves must be allowed to say what was and what was not 'Buddhism', or what was and what was not significant. This meant that the "dogmes" of "la philologie indienne" be, as far as possible, ignored. But it also meant that that 'reconstruction' would have to have new criteria by which it could select from the mass of material those ideas or concepts which should be dealt with.

Confronted with this situation and admitting from the outset that at this point in time any attempted reconstruction would have to be preliminary and tentative, merely a first attempt to establish a crude map of the territory, the most controlled method seemed to be the following. I would select one text from the collection - by necessity a relatively short one. I would then read through it carefully noting any ideas, themes or topics which received emphasis, occurred repeatedly or appeared in any way to be significant. Having noted these ideas, themes and topics, they would then be taken as the 'new criteria' by which I could select

from the mass of the larger material those ideas or concepts which should be dealt with. By thus allowing my selected text to establish the norms of significance it appeared to me that I could best avoid any presuppositions. Armed with these criteria I could then read through the collection as a whole and collect those passages which were parallel or related in theme, topic and treatment. Having collected and analyzed these passages, and having assumed for the sake of exposition a hypothetical literate member of the Buddhist community at Gilgit, I could then suggest - and this was *my first intention* in the study I wanted to undertake - how that hypothetical literate member of the community, assuming that he was familiar with the literature known to have been available to him, could have or would have interpreted the one text I had selected from among the collection. But this is only one thing which such a study could suggest. The same procedure could also generate another set of suggestions. As a matter of fact, by surveying the whole collection for passages which were parallel or related in theme, topic or idea to the themes and topics found in the selected text, I could determine both which themes and topics were unique to that selected text, and which had wider currency, as well as the degree of that wider currency. I could, in short, determine some of the elements which were common to the collection as a whole, some, if not all, of the defining characteristics of what could be called 'the Buddhism of Gilgit'. And this was *my second intention* in the study I wanted to undertake.

Having decided on this method as that best suited to my intentions, I had to decide on a text. I chose the *Bhaiṣajyaguru-sūtra* for a number of reasons: it was short; it had received relatively little attention so that a study of it would not be encumbered with too much prior exegetical baggage; it was (or at least it appeared to me when I first started) a relatively straight-forward text; and, finally, it appeared to be relatively representative of the collection as a whole, a sort of middle-of-the-road text in terms of doctrinal developments (how true all this was I, again, did not realize until much later.)

With a method and a text selected I had to make some decisions concerning the presentation. I was first of all concerned with the construction of my 'notes', postponing for the moment the question of where to put them. Since one of my primary intentions was to discover the elements in *Bhg* which were elements common to the collection as a whole, and since the nature of the commonality had to be clearly shown, I was of necessity required to show

both the number and the kind of parallelisms which could be found in the larger collection. This, coupled with the fact that very few of the texts at Gilgit are well known, almost none of them translated, and some of them not even edited, ruled out the possibility of simply giving references to the various texts, and in effect dictated that I rely very heavily on textual citation. Since I had to depend on textual citations anyhow, it seemed to me that perhaps the least biased method of presentation would be to compile for each topic discussed a kind of small anthology of representative passages from the collection as a whole bearing on that topic. These little anthologies would then be given first with little or no comment. My own views or remarks could then be added at the end of the anthologies as postfaces where I could draw what conclusions I saw. I followed this method whenever practicable.

I also decided - much to my later chagrin - that the 'texts' thus collected should be translated. And it must be noted here that these translations, based as they very often are on uncertain textual traditions, and done by an inexperienced hand, are only intended as tentative, in some cases merely approximate. I have tried both in my translation of *Bhg* and in the translations in the 'notes' to be as literal as possible. Often - it has been pointed out to me - at the expense of the English language. I can only say that the language of the original texts I was working with was rarely beautiful, often clumsy, sometimes incomprehensible, and to make it appear otherwise in translation would be to misrepresent my documents; although I have undoubtedly added my own characteristic brand of stylistic ugliness.

Once these 'anthologies' were collected and translated, I had to be concerned with the nature and extent of the remarks to be included in the postfaces. Here it seemed to me to be important, given that my 'reconstruction' could only be a kind of preliminary archaeological survey of the literary remains, to note in particular patterns, types and themes which appeared repeatedly, to note, in effect, the structural aspect of the presentation of the doctrine. But since I was also interested in the kind of 'Buddhism' the available presentation of the doctrine could generate, I thought it was equally important to pay close attention to the functional aspect of the ideas and practices which this presentation made available, to pay close attention to the way in which the practices,

especially, were thought to work, and the goal for which they were intended, *according to the sources*. Here too I wanted to note any functional interchangeability of ideas and practices, and the degree of this interchangeability. These, then, were the major kinds of things I wanted to signal in my remarks.

There were also two other kinds of things which also seemed worth noting. First of all, it became obvious very early on that the picture of "Buddhism" that was emerging from my sources did not correspond at all, or very imperfectly, to what, for the lack of a better term, might be called 'The Buddhism of our handbooks'. It therefore seemed important to note the way and the degree to which these "Buddhisms' differed. A second thing that occurred to me in the process of my research was that the picture I was getting did, in fact, often correspond in some interesting ways with the picture of Buddhism which emerges from anthropological studies of Buddhism in modern South-East Asia. This, it seemed, was also worth noting; although my treatment here - given my unfamiliarity with anthropological literature - could only be suggestive and in no sense systematic.

Obviously 'notes' constructed in this fashion could be very long - the longest, in fact, is forty-three pages. This presented the problem of where to put them. It would have been theoretically possible to write them up as a long, unified, introductory essay; or to add them as a series of appendices at the end of the translation; or take the text paragraph by paragraph, give the translation of each paragraph first and then the note based on or related to that paragraph immediately after; then the next paragraph, etc. I felt that at this time a unified, introductory essay would be premature. I actually tried it but found such an exposition had too many gaps and holes. The second alternative shared with the first the fact that it would result in separating the text of *Bhg* from the context in which it was best read. I wanted *Bhg* to be read in light of all the other sources in the collection, as an integral part of that collection. The third alternative therefore best suited my purposes. If someone were to object that because of the way I have presented it it is very difficult, if not impossible, to read the translation of *Bhg* by itself, I would say that that was exactly what I intended. For the purposes of what I wanted to study, *Bhg, by itself*, was of very little importance. As a concession to the reader who might not share my interests I have, however, given a

detailed 'Table of Contents', which also gives by means of headings added to each paragraph number a rough idea of what I thought the structure of the text to be. This same 'Table of Contents' provides an approximate guide to the subject of the various notes.

II. Abbreviations, Bibliography and Notes For Textual Sources

AdP i = E. Conze, *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Aṣṭādaśasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā, Chapters 55 to 70 Corresponding to the 5th Abhisamaya* (Rome: 1962)

AdP ii = E. Conze, *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Aṣṭādaśasahasrika-prajñāpāramitā, Chapters 70 to 82 Corresponding to the 6th, 7th and 8th Abhisamaya* (Rome: 1974)

Note: For information on the correspondence of Conze's editions to the Mss. see the 'Introduction' to the respective volumes. The translation contained in both volumes is 'reproduced' in E. Conze, *The Large Sutra on Perfect Wisdom, with the Divisions of the Abhisamayālaṅkāra* (Berkeley: 1975) 431-652. My references are always to page and line number of Conze's edition. I used *AdP* i and ii very little because it, of all the Gilgit texts, is probably the best known.

Aj = *Ajitasenavyākaraṇanirdeśa-sūtra*

Ms.: R. Vira and L. Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts (Facsimile Edition)*, Part 9 (New Delhi: 1974) No. 40, fols. 2336-2416.

Ed.: D.M. Bhattacharya, "Ajitasenavyākaraṇam", in N. Dutt, *Gilgit Manuscripts*, Vol. I (Srinagar: 1939) 103-36.

Tib: There appears to be neither a Tibetan nor a Chinese translation of this interesting text. This makes it all the more important that the ed. of the Skt. - which has been rather carelessly done - be corrected.

Note: References which give only page and line (e.g. *Aj* 106.7) without citing any text are always to Bhattacharya's edition. When textual citations are actually given I have almost always consulted the Ms. and reference to it is also given.

Other works on *Aj*.

None.

Bbp = *Buddhabalādhānaprātihāryavikurvāṇanirdeśa-sūtra*

Ms.: R. Vira and L. Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts (Facsimile Edition)*, Part 7 (New Delhi: 1974) no. 7 (end), fols. 1288-1297.

Ed.: N. Dutt, "Ārya-buddha-balādhāna-prātihārya-vikurvāṇa-nirdeśa-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra", in *Gilgit Manuscripts*, Vol.IV (Calcutta: 1959) 171-83.

G. Schopen, "The Five Leaves of the Buddhabalādhānaprātihāryavikurvāṇanirdeśa-sūtra Found at Gilgit," *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 6 (1978) 1-18.

Tib. *'phags pa saṅs rgyas kyi stobs bskyed pa'i cho 'phrul rnam par 'phrul ba bstan pa źes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo.*

D.T. Suzuki, *The Tibetan Tripitaka, Peking Edition* (Tokyo-Kyoto: 1958) Vol. 34 no. 853, 189-4-7 to 195-3-4.

Note: References such as *Bbp* 1289.3 are to the folio and line number of the Ms, as well as to my edition in *JIP* where folio and line number are indicated in the transliterated text. References such as *Bbp* 192-3-4 are to the page-leaf-line in the Tib. translation. Since only a small portion of the text is preserved in the Gilgit Ms., most of my references are to the Tib. Judging by the five extant leaves, the Tib. translation represents a text very close to the Skt. text that circulated at Gilgit. Differences between the two are of a very minor nature.

Other works on *Bbp*

None.

Eka = *Ekādaśamukha-dhāranī*

Ms.: R. Vira and L. Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts (Facsimile Edition)*, Part 9 (New Delhi: 1974) No. 33, fols. 2417-2444.

Ed.: N. Dutt, "Ekādaśamukham", in *Gilgit Manuscripts*, Vol.I (Srinagar: 1939) 35-40

Tib: *'phags pa spyan ras gzigs dbaṅ phyug zal bcu gcig pa ces bya ba'i gzuṅs. Die Xerokopie des Lhasa-Kanjur*, Vol. 91, 235-4-1 to 236-4-7.

Note: References are to Dutt's edition.

Other works on *Eka*

None

GP = *Gilgit Prajñāpāramitā* (i.e. the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā* up to the end of Ch. 37, and then the *Aṣṭādaśasāhasrika* up to what corresponds to the end of the 4th Abhisamaya.)

Ms.: R. Vira and L. Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts (Facsimile Edition)*, Part 3 (New Delhi: 1966) fols.175-254; Part 4 (New Delhi: 1966) fols. 255-336; Part 5 (New Delhi: 1970) fols. 337-666.

Ed.: An edition of this Ms. is in progress. Professor Lewis Lancaster of the University of California, Berkeley, is editing the 1st and 2nd Abhisamaya. The last word I have had from him indicated that he hoped to have his edition completed by the fall of 1978. I have agreed to edit the 3rd and 4th Abhisamaya, but I have had little time to give to the project and it remains just barely begun.

Note: I noticed only too late that in referring to this Ms. I sometimes used the original folio number and sometimes that assigned to it in the facsimile. Since both numbers are clearly visible on the facsimile, and since I have cited this Ms. only rarely, I did not bother to change this. Some portions of this Ms. are translated in E. Conze, *The Large Sutra on Perfect Wisdom* (Berkeley: 1975), but see my review in *IIJ* 19 (1977) 135-52, on his handling of the Gilgit material.

Kv = *Kāraṇḍavyūha-sūtra*

Ms.: R. Vira and L. Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts (Facsimile Edition)*, Part 7 (New Delhi: 1974) No. 12, fols. 1594-1667.

Ed.: P.L. Vaidya, "Avalokiteśvaraguṇa-kāraṇḍavyūha", in *Mahāyāna-Sūtra-Saṃgraha*, Part I (Darbhanga: 1961) 254-308. [This, like most of Vaidya's "editions", is essentially a reprint of an earlier edition done by someone else; in this case S. Samasrami in 1872.

Tib: *'phags pa za ma tog bkod pa źes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo* *Die Xerokopie des Lhasa-Kanjur*, Vol. 53, 159-3-2 to 196-1-5.

Note: Although I occasionally refer to the Ms., most of my references to and citations from *Kv* are based on Vaidya's edition. This "edition", as far as I can tell, is based on a single late Ms., the language of which Vaidya described as "horribly corrupt" and "horrible Sanskrit". This edition also differs very often from the Gilgit Ms. - at least in so far as we are able to judge by the fragmentary and chaotic condition of the latter. Regamey, in speaking first of the Nepalese Mss., says they all "...présentent des divergences presqu'à chaque phrase. La découverte de fragments, malheureusement très endommagés, du *Kāraṇḍavyūha*, parmi les manuscrits de Gilgit (VIe-VIIe siècle), au lieu de fournir l'aide tant espérée, porta la confusion à son comble: ce manuscrit, le plus ancien qu'on connaît, est également le plus fantaisiste et le plus incohérent (p. 418 of last item cited below.)". My own experience with this Ms. all too plainly confirms Regamey's observations. In light of this unfortunate textual situation I have tried to be very circumspect in my use of *Kv*. I have, for example, tried never to cite anything from *Kv* which is not also found in at least one other source at Gilgit. In spite of all this, the evidence from *Kv* must always be accepted with some reservations.

Other works on the Gilgit *Kv*.

[All of the following refer to, or give readings from the Gilgit *Kv*.

C. Regamey, "Randbemerkungen zur Sprache und Textüberlieferung des Kāraṇḍavyūha", *Asiatica, Festschrift F. Weller* (Leipzig: 1954) 514-27.

- - -, "Lexicological Gleanings from the Kāraṇḍavyūha", *Indian Linguistics* (Chatterji Jubilee Volume) 16 (1955) 1-11.

- - -, "Le pseudo-hapax ratikara et la lampe qui rit dans le 'Sūtra des Ogresses' bouddhique", *Asiatische Studien/Études Asiatiques* 18/19 (1965) 175-206.

- - -, "Motifs vichnouïtes et sivaites dans le Kāraṇḍavyūha", *Études tibétaines dédiées à la mémoire de Marcelle Lalou* (Paris: 1971) 411-32.

MvK = *Maitreyavyākaraṇa*

Ms.: R.Vira and L.Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts (Facsimile Edition)*, Part 7 (New Delhi: 1974) No. 13, fols. 1536-1542.

Ed.: P.C. Mazumder, "Ārya Maitreya Vyākaraṇaṃ", in N. Dutt, *Gilgit Manuscripts* IV (Calcutta: 1959) 187-214.

S. Lévi, "Maitreya le consolateur", *Études d'orientalisme publiées par le Musée Guimet à la mémoire de Raymonde Linossier*, T.II (Paris: 1932) 355-402. [The ed. of a Nepalese Ms., with Tib. text of first 25 verses.]

Tib: *'phags pa byams pa luṅ bstan pa*
Die Xerokopie des Lhasa-Kanjur, Vol. 74, 247-2-7 to 250-1-5.

Note: References of the kind *MvK* 42 are always to the verse number of Mazumder's edition, but whenever the text itself is given I cite my own reading of the Ms.. I have also occasionally made reference to, or given a reading from, Lévi's ed.

Other works on Gilgit *MvK*

G. Schopen, "Text-Critical Notes on the Gilgit Redaction of the *Maitreyavyākaraṇa*", unpublished paper. [The Gilgit *MvK* represents a redaction somewhat different from that found in the Nepalese text. This, unfortunately, has not been taken into account by Mazumder who, in editing the Gilgit text has adopted - promiscuously it seems to me - many readings from the Nepalese text. (The Tibetan translation agrees in most cases with the latter.) There are also a number of minor and few major wrong readings of the Ms. in Mazumder's edition.]

Rkp = *Ratnaketuparivarta-sūtra*

Ms.: R. Vira and L. Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts (Facsimile Edition)*, Part 6 (New Delhi: 1974) No.7, fols. 1166-1234; Part 7, no. 7 (cont.) 1235-1287, No. 29, fols. 1298-1331.

Ed.: N. Dutt, "Mahāsannipāta-ratnaketu-dhāraṇī-sūtra", in *Gilgit Manuscripts*, Vol.IV (Calcutta: 1959) 1-138.

Z. Nakamura, "Gilgit Manuscript of the *Mahāsannipātaratnaketusūtra* kept in the National Archives, Katmandu", *Hokke Bunka Kenkyū* 1 (1975) 13-37. [5 leaves, the last of which contains the colophon to Ch. 5.]

Y. Kurumiya, *Ratnaketuparivarta, Sanskrit Text* (Kyoto: 1978).

Tib: *'phags pa 'dus pa chen po rin po che tog gi gzuṅs źes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo.*

D.T. Suzuki, *The Tibetan Tripitaka, Peking Edition* (Tokyo-Kyoto: 1958), Vol. 32, No. 806, 180-5-4 to 220-3-3.
Cf. Y. Kurumiya, *Ratnaketuparivarta, Sanskrit and Tibetan Texts*, Ph.D. thesis, The Australian National University, 1974. [Kurumiya's ed. of the Skt. text listed above is a revised version of the first part of this thesis. The second part contains an ed. of the Tib. translation based on the Kanjur editions, but also gives interesting variants from the Tunhuang Mss.]

Note: My references, e.g. *Rkp* 21.6, are always to the page and line number of Kurumiya's published edition. References to the Ms. are always indicated as such.

Other works on the Gilgit *Rkp*.

Y. Kurumiya, "Bibliographical Notes of the *Ratnaketuparivarta*", *Hokke Bunka Kenkyū* 1 (1975) 39-45.

- - -, "A Verse of the Ratnaketuparivarta", *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 47 (1975) 452-447.

Sgṭ = *Saṃghāṭa-sūtra*

Ms.: R. Vira and L. Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts (Facsimile Edition)*, Part 8 (New Delhi: 1974) No. 36, fols. 1949-2107; No. 37, fols. 2108-2289; No. 38, fols. 2290-2305; No. 39, fols. 2306-2325; Part 9, No. 39 (cont.) fols. 2326-2335.

Ed.: An edition of the Gilgit Mss. of *Sgṭ* was made by R.A. Gunatilaka at Cambridge under the supervision of H.W. Bailey; it has, however, not been published and I have not seen it.

Tib: *'phags pa zuṅ gi mdo'i chos kyi rnam graṅs*
Die Xerokopie des Lhasa-Kanjur, Vol.50, 179-2-1 to 214-3-2.

Note: Since I did not have access to Gunatilaka's ed. my knowledge of *Sgṭ* is based entirely on the facsimile. I have used two of the four Mss., Nos. 36 and 37, and my references are usually to No. 37, which is the more complete of the two.

Other works on the Gilgit *Sgṭ*

R.A. Gunatilaka, "A Short Introduction to the Four Incomplete Manuscripts of the 'Saṃghāta-sūtra' kept in the National Archives, New Delhi", *Studies in Indo-Asian Art and Culture* (R. Vira Volume), Vol. 1, ed. P. Ratnam (New Delhi: 1972) 71-77.

O. von Hinüber, "The Gilgit Samghata-sutra in the S.P.S. Museum, Srinagar", *Jammu and Kashmir State Research Biannual* II No. 2 (1976) 40-42.

ŚmD = *Śrīmahādevīvyākaraṇa*

Ms.: R. Vira and L. Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts (Facsimile Edition)* Part 7 (New Delhi: 1974) under No.29 (end) fols. 1316-1327

Ed.: A.C. Banerji, "Śrīmahādevīvyākaraṇaṃ", in *Gilgit Manuscripts*, Vol. I (Srinagar: 1939) 93-100.

Tib: *'phags pa lha mo chen mo dpal luṅ bstan pa*
Die Xerokopie des Lhasa-Kanjur, Vol. 61, 194-3-6 to 199-1-7.

Note: References such as *ŚmD* 94.2 are to Banerji's edition. References to the Ms. are so indicated. Note that the colophon of this Ms. gives the title of the text as *(dva)daśa(da)ṇḍakanāmāṣṭaśata-vimalīkaraṇā nāma mahāyānasūtraṃ* (fol. 1326.6; cf. *ŚmD* 94.11).

Other works on the Gilgit *ŚmD*

None

SP = *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra*

Ms.: S. Watanabe, *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka Manuscripts Found in Gilgit*, Part I, Photographic Reproduction (Tokyo: 1972).

R. Vira and L. Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts, (Facsimile Edition)*, Part 9 (New Delhi: 1974) fols.2785-2908; Part 10 (New Delhi: 1974) fols.2909-3220.

Ed.: S. Watanabe, *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka Manuscripts Found in Gilgit*, Romanized Text (Tokyo: 1975)

A. Yuyama and H. Toda, *The Huntington Fragment F of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra, Studia Philologica Buddhica, Occasional Paper Series* (Tokyo: 1977) [pp. 8-10, one folio missing from Watanabe.]

H. Kern and B. Nanjio, *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka, Bibliotheca Buddhica* X (St. Pétersbourg: 1912).

Tib: *dam pa'i chos pad ma dkar po žes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo* D.T. Suzuki, *The Tibetan Tripitaka, Peking Edition* (Tokyo-Kyoto: 1955), Vol. 30, No. 781, 1-1-1 to 84-2-5.

Note: References of the kind *SP* 114.2 always refer to Watanabe's romanized text. References to the Ms. are always preceded by the abbreviation 'fol.', and again are always to Watanabe's 'Photographic Reproduction'. Since the Gilgit Mss. are not complete, I have cited the missing passages from Kern's edition. The reference then always appears in the form e.g. *SP* (Kern ed.) 47.2.

Other works on the Gilgit *SP*

A. Yuyama, *A Bibliography of the Sanskrit Texts of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra* (Canberra: 1970) 34-36 [a bibliography of work on the Gilgit *SP* up to 1970.]

Z. Nakamura, "On Four Sheets of Gilgit Manuscripts of Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra in the Bill *(sic)* Library, *Añjali* (Wijesekera Volume), ed. J. Tilakasiri (Peradeniya: 1970) 63-74. [Corresponding to Kern 102.1-15; 177.7-179.1; 479.12-481.5; the fourth is not yet identified.]

H. Bechert, *Über die "Marburger Fragmente" des Saddharmapuṇḍarīka, Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse*, 1972, no. 1 [The Gilgit text in the context of the history of the textual tradition of *SP*.]

- - -, "Remarks on the Textual History of Saddharmapuṇḍarīka" *Studies in Indo-Asian Art and Culture* (R. Vira Volume), Vol. 2, ed. P. Ratnam (New Delhi: 1973) 21-27 [The intentions of this paper were "to summarize the main conclusions" of the preceding item.]

Y. Kurumiya, "Hokekyō bonpon shahon okugaku kenkyū nōto", in *Hokekyō shinkō no shokeitai* (Kyōto: 1976) 109-46 [On the colophons of the Skt. Mss. of *SP*, including the Gilgit colophon.]

- - -, "Notes of a Facsimile Edition of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra in the "Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts' (Parts 9-10, Reproduced by Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra", *Hokekyō Bunka Kenkyūjo* 2 (1976) 45-57 [Essentially a diagrammatically presented survey of the contents of the Mss.]

SR = *Samādhirāja-sūtra*

Ms.: R. Vira and L. Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts (Facsimile Edition)*, Part 9 (New Delhi: 1974) No. 46, fols. 2461-2784.

Ed.: N. Dutt, *Gilgit Manuscripts*, Vol. II, Part 1 (Srinagar: 1941); Vol. II, Part 2 (Calcutta: 1953); Vol. II, Part 3 (Calcutta: 1954).

S. Matsunami, "Samādhirāja-sūtra", *Taishō Daigaku Kenkyū Kiyō* 60 (1975) 244-188 [chs. 1-4]; "Samādhirāja-sūtra (II)", *ibid.*, 61 (1975) 796-761 [chs. 5-7]. [This is an edition of the Nepalese redaction based on 3 Mss. from the Tokyo University Library but variants from the Gilgit Ms. are given in a separate critical apparatus.]

Tib: *'phags pa chos thams cad kyi raṅ bźin mñam pa ñid rnam par spros pa tiṅ ṅe 'dzin gyi rgyal po źes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo.*

D.T. Suzuki, *The Tibetan Tripitaka, Peking Edition* (Tokyo-Kyoto: 19) Vol.31, no. 795, 271-1-1 to 312-4-8; Vol.33, 1-1-1 to 34-4.8.

Note: References of the kind *SR* XXI 23 are always to Dutt's ed., the roman numerals referring to chapter, the arabic to verse number. For references to prose passages I give page and line number of Dutt's ed., e.g. *SR* 507.2. Note [14]b. sometimes departs from this scheme since there I have occasionally preferred to cite the Ms. reading rather than Dutt's edition. In such cases I have always indicated this.

Other works on the Gilgit *SR*

J. Filliozat, "La mort volontaire par le feu et la tradition bouddhique indienne", *Journal Asiatique* 251 (1963) 21-51. [Trans. of Ch. 33, with some omissions, and discussion.]

F. Weller, "Der Arme Heinrich in Indien", *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 68 (1973) 437-48. [Trans. of *SR* 469.5-486.18].

StA = *Sarvatathāgatādhiṣṭhānasattvāvalokanabuddhakṣetradarśanavyūha-sūtra*

Ms.: R. Vira and L. Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts (Facsimile Edition)*, Part 7 (New Delhi: 1974) No. 30, fols. 1746-1775; Part 8, No. 30 (cont.) fols. 1776-1815; No. 35, fols. 1816-1837.

Ed.: N. Dutt, "Sarvatathāgatādhiṣṭhāna-sattvāvalokana-buddhakṣetrasandarśanavyūhaṃ" in *Gilgit Manuscripts*, Vol. I (Srinagar: 1939) 49-89.

Tib: *'phags pa de bźin gśegs pa thams cad kyi byin gyis rlabs sems can la gzigs śiṅ saṅs rgyas kyi źiṅ gi bkod pa kun tu ston pa źes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo.*
D.T. Suzuki, *The Tibetan Tripitaka, Peking Edition* (Tokyo-Kyoto: 1958) Vol. 27, No. 766, 270-5-1 to 279-3-4.

Note: References such as *StA* 75.2 are to Dutt's edition. In addition to the usual weaknesses which characterize all his work on the Gilgit material, Dutt's edition of *StA* suffers from the fact that

he ignored the second Ms. (No. 35) altogether. This Ms., although very fragmentary, preserves some important variants. Unfortunately, the leaves of this same Ms. are not - in spite of Chandra's statement to the contrary - arranged in their proper order in the facsimile edition. [The correct order, using the numbers assigned to each leaf in the facsimile is as follows: (Since Chandra has placed recto and verso of the same folio side-by-side, I use L and R to refer to the photo which occurs on the left or right hand side of the page; numbers our of sequence are italicized.) 1819L, 1819R, 1820L, 1820R, 1821L, 1821R, 1822L, 1822R, 1823L, 1823R, 1824L, 1824R, 1826L, 1826R, 1827L, 1827R, 1828L, 1828R, 1829L, 1829R, *1816L, 1816R, 1817R, 1817L, 1818R, 1818L,* 1830L, 1830R, 1831L, 1831R, 1832L, 1832R, *1825L, 1825R, 1833R, 1833L,* 1834L, 1834R, 1835L, 1835R, 1836L, 1836R, 1837L, 1837R.] The longer passages from *StA* represent my own reading of the Mss.

Other works on Gilgit *StA*

None.

Vaj = *Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra*

Ms.: R. Vira and L. Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts (Facsimile Edition)*, Part 7 (New Delhi: 1974) No. 10(1), fols. 1380-1393.

Ed.: N.P. Chakravarti, "The Gilgit Text of the Vajracchedikā", in G. Tucci, *Minor Buddhist Texts*, Part I (Rome: 1956) 175-192.

E. Conze, *Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā* (Rome: 1957). [An edition based essentially on Müller's late Mss. from Japan, but gives - sometimes imperfectly - variants from the Gilgit text.]

N. Dutt, "Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā", in *Gilgit Manuscripts*, Vol. IV (Calcutta: 1959) 141-70 [Ed. of Gilgit Ms. with missing portions supplied from Müller.]

Note: My references are to folio number (original pagination) and line number, and therefore to both the facsimile and Chakravarti's ed. (where folio and line number are inserted into the text). Chakravarti's text is still the best in terms of the *Vajracchedikā* current at Gilgit.

In addition to text titles the most important abbreviations in the references are the following:

GBMs = R. Vira and L. Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts (Facsimile Edition)* Parts 3-10. The number of the individual Parts is indicated by lower case Roman numerals; e.g. GBMs vii = GBMs Part 7.

GMs = N. Dutt, *Gilgit Manuscripts*, 4 volumes. The individual volume number is indicated by lower case Roman numerals; e.g. GMs iv = GMs Volume 4.

Lhasa = *Die Xerokopie des Lhasa-Kanjur*. References will look like this: 195-4-2 = page of the xerox copy - 'leaf' - line. *Reference is not to the original folio number.*

Pek = D.T. Suzuki, *The Tibetan Tripitaka*. Peking Edition. My references follow the usual convention; e.g. 46-3-1 = page of the photomechanical reproduction - 'leaf' - line. Again, *reference is not to the original folio number.*

General:

Although I have had the use of a microfilm belonging to Professor J.W. de Jong of the entire Gilgit collection, I have taken as my standard of reference the facsimile editions published by Vira and Chandra. In referring to the Mss., I have therefore, unless it is stated otherwise, used the numbers assigned to the 'folios' in the facsimile edition, *not the original folio numbers.*

When quoting from manuscripts I generally give the text exactly as it occurs in that manuscript with no attempt to 'correct' or edit it. Only when it seemed absolutely necessary have I added missing letters or syllables, corrected spellings, or added punctuation. The original punctuation is represented by a dot raised about a half-space above the normal position of a period, e.g. p.159 lines 3, 5, 6, 7, etc. Any other punctuation is my own. The presence of these dots in a piece of text will always indicate that it is being quoted from the manuscript.

III. Other abbreviations:

BCLS = *Bulletins de la classe des lettres et des sciences morales et politiques, Académie Royale de Belgique.*

BEFEO = *Bulletin de l'école française d'extrême-orient*

BSOAS = *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*

IIJ = *Indo-Iranian Journal*

JA = *Journal Asiatique*

JAOS = *Journal of the American Oriental Society*

JIP = *Journal of Indian Philosophy*

TRANSLATION

AND

NOTES

[0] *Oṃ. Homage to the All-knowing !*
Homage to the Blessed One, the Tathāgata
Bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabharāja.[1]

[1]) T: Homage to all Buddhas and Bodhisattvas

---

a. There is some question concerning the name of our Buddha, or at least the full form of his name. The question turns on whether or not -rāja is added as the final element. Here in the invocation Y clearly has it and X, though fragmentary, probably had it. The addition of -rāja in the invocation is somewhat curious since nowhere in the body of the text is this addition made. The evidence from the Tibetan translations is even more curious. In the Tibetan translation of *Bhg* the transliterated Sanskrit title is given in all versions without -rāja, but in the Tibetan translation of the title P adds rgyal po, while N,D and L do not. Apart from this, in the whole of the Tibetan *Bhg* - where the name of our Buddha is found again and again - -rāja is added to the name only on one occasion([10] n.15), and here all four versions make the addition, although there is nothing to set this passage off from any of the others where the name is mentioned and the addition here seems to be wholly arbitrary. In *StP* the situation is as follows: rgyal po is added at [5.13]n.a by P, N and L; at [4] n.f and [6] n.b by N, D and L; at [16] n.x and [21] n.e by P,D and L; at [6] n.k, [7] n.p, [8] n.n, [9] n.j, [11] n.g, [13] n.j, [14] n.v, [15] n.m, [16] n.v by N and L; and at [16] n.b, [17] n.o, [18] n.b, [18] n.f, [19] n.c, [19] n.f, [21] n.i and [21] n.p it is added by all four versions. Apart from *Bhg*, the only other text at Gilgit which refers to our Buddha by name is *Bbp*. It, in at least its Tibetan translation (the Skt. of the passage in question has not been preserved), refers to him only as sman gyi bla bai ḍū rya'i 'od. Outside of Gilgit we should note that in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, in the passages it quotes from *Bhg*, the name is always given as Bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabha*rāja*; and the same form is found in the *Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa* (Vaidya ed.) 5.8, in the Tibetan translation of the *Ārya-tathāgata-vaiḍūryaprabha-nāma-baladhāna-samādhi-dhāraṇī* (Pek. vol.6, no.137) 139-4-4, and in Fonds Pelliot

tibétain nos. 247 and 248. But in Dpal brtsegs' *gsuṅ rab rin po che'i gtam rgyud śā kya'i rabs rgyud* (Pek. vol.144, no.5844), in his quotation from *StP*, the name is given simply as sman gyi bla bai ḍū rya'i 'od (129-5-7), and in his quotation from *Bhg* as sman gyi bla (181-3-7). About all we can say here is that it appears that -rāja was probably not an original part of the name, and that after its initial appearance it was an optional element which in time became increasingly less so.

All of this would not be of great significance were it not for the citation of our text in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*. As we have already seen, *Śikṣ* 174.1-175.13 quotes almost all of *Bhg* [11], the whole of [12], about half of [15], and about three quarters of [16]. Here the title of the text from which Śāntideva was quoting is given as *Bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūrya-prabharāja-sūtra*. A problem, however, arises when we note that Śāntideva quotes another short passage at *Śikṣ* 13.12 from a text he calls the *Bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabha-sūtra*. It is natural enough to assume, as Bendall and Edgerton in *BHSD* have done, that this is the same text as that quoted at *Śikṣ* 174.1ff. Such an assumption seems to be supported by the fact that both *Mahāvyutpatti* 1404 and Dpal brtsegs (181-3-6) refer to, presumably, our *Bhg* under the title *Bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabha -(sūtra)*; and the *dkar-chag ldan-dkar ma* (Lalou, *JA* (1953) 323) refers to it as the *(de bžin gśegs pa) sman gyi bla bai ḍu rya 'od (kyi sṅon gyi smon lam gyi khyad par rgyas pa)*, while the *rgyud sde spyi'i rnam par gžag pa rgyas par brjod* (Lessing and Wayman ed.) 108.9 refers to it as the *(de bžin gśegs pa) sman gyi bla bai ḍū rya'i 'od kyi rgyal po'i (sṅon gyi,* etc.). It would appear that as with the name of the Buddha by itself, so that name in the title of the text could either add the -rāja or dispense with it; or put another way, in the same way as both names refer to the same Buddha, so both titles refer to the same text. (X is the only Ms. at Gilgit which preserves a title, and here it is given simply as āxx(x)ṣajyaguru nāma mahāyānasūtram.) But our problem arises from the fact that the passage quoted at *Śikṣ* 13.12 under the title *Bhaiṣajyaguru-vaiḍūryaprabha-sūtra*, unlike those quoted at *Śikṣ* 174.1ff, is not found in any of the Mss. of *Bhg* found at Gilgit. It reads:

> etac ca bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabha-sūtre draṣṭavyaṃ / yas tu mahāsattva evaṃ śrutvāpi bodhisattvacaryāduṣkaratām api prajñayāvagāhyotsahata eva sakaladuḥkhitajanaparitrāṇadhuraṃ avavoḍhuṃ tena vandanapūjanapāpadeśanapuṇyānumodanabuddhādhye-ṣaṇayācanabodhipariṇāmanaṃ kṛtvā kalyāṇamitraṃ (adhyeṣya; so

Vaidya) taduktānuvādena svayaṃ vā vaktavyaṃ / samanvāharācāryāham evaṃ nāmety uktvā /

This passage is not only not found in the Gilgit Mss. of *Bhg*, it is also unlike in both tone and content anything that is. It is, more than anything else that I know, similar to the Mahāyāna 'ordination' formulae discussed by N. Dutt in "Bodhisattva Prātimokṣa Sūtra", *Indian Historical Quarterly* 7 (1931) 262ff. It is of course possible that Śāntideva was quoting from a redaction of our text which contained this passage, but given the 'tone and content' of the passage, this seems highly unlikely. It also seems unlikely that some other text, a text dealing with 'ordination' procedures, would have had the same name as our text, and that the quotation was taken from that. The most likely possibility seems to be that Śāntideva gave the wrong title to the source of his quotation, and that the passage in question has nothing to do with our, and probably the only, *Bhg*.

b. There is one other major point in reference to the name of our Buddha which must be mentioned. As is well known there are a number of other figures, mostly bodhisattvas but at least one Buddha, who have names which have one or two elements in common with that of Bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabha. At Gilgit these include the bodhisattvas Bhaiṣajyarāja, who is mentioned at *Sgṭ* 2109.6; *SP* 3.26, ch.X, 156.1, ch.XXII, etc.; Bhaiṣajyasamudgata, who is referred to at *SP* 3.27, 173.23, etc.; and Bhaiṣajyasena, referred to at *Kv* 258.14 and prominent throughout *Sgṭ*. Outside of Gilgit we find Bhaiṣajyarāja as the name of a former Buddha in ch.XII of the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa* and at *Lalitavistara* (Lefmann ed.) 172.8 (Lamotte, *L'enseignement*, 375 n.11, by an oversight gives the name as Bhaiṣajyaguru). There have been a number of attempts to connect one or another of these figures - usually the bodhisattva Bhaiṣajyarāja - with Bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabha, usually by arguing that since the bodhisattva Bhaiṣajyarāja is mentioned several times in *SP*, and since the *SP* is supposed to be earlier than *Bhg*, the Buddha Bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabha must have been developed from the figure of the "earlier" bodhisattva. The assumption, of course, behind all such attempts is that since both figures had names with Bhaiṣajya as the first element and rāja as the final element, they must be related. A further assumption was that any figure which had bhaiṣajya as a part of his name must have been conceived of as a "healer". Given the nature of the arguments which support them, I think it is entirely unnecessary to discuss these attempts in detail. Note only that

the character of these figures, especially the two most prominent, Bhaiṣajyarāja and Bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabha, have absolutely nothing in common. Bhaiṣajyarāja, as he is most fully presented in *SP* ch.XXII, has very much in common with another figure in Buddhist literature, but his name happens to be Kṣemadatta (cf. *SR* ch.XXXIII and J. Filliozat, "La mort volontaire par le feu et la tradition bouddhique indienne", *JA* 251 (1963) 21-51). The fact that both have Bhaiṣajya as the first element of their names is completely without relevance. As we will see below in some detail, Bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabha, even in *Bhg*, the most important text devoted to him, is not conceived of primarily as a "healer". This is even more so in regard to Bhaiṣajyarāja. The only healing functions mentioned in the whole of the Bhaiṣajyarājapūrvayoga-parivarta are ascribed not to Bhaiṣajyarāja, but to the power of the text itself (-āyaṃ saddharmapuṇḍarīko dharmaparyāyaḥ ... vaḍya ivāturāṇā[ṃ] ... sarvasattvānāṃ ... sarvavyādhi-cchedakaḥ, *SP* 166.27f; bhaiṣajyabhūto bhaviṣyati glānānāṃ sattvānāṃ vyādhispṛṣṭānāṃ; imaṃ dharmaparyāyaṃ śrutvā vyādhiḥ kāye nākramiṣyati na jarā nākālamṛtyuḥ, *SP* 168.18). Finally, the significance of the fact that the names of the two figures sometimes have -rāja in common as the final element is very largely undercut by the additional fact that the evidence indicates that -rāja was not an original part of the Buddha's name and that even after it was added it remained optional. It is of course not impossible that it was added under the influence of the name Bhaiṣajyarāja at a time when this bodhisattva became prominent. But this would obviously imply that the Buddha Bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabha, if anything, preceded the bodhisattva in time.

Implicit in what I have said above is the warning that if we are to avoid misunderstandings we must read texts rather than analyze names. In specific reference to *Bhg* this means that we must look very closely at the way in which the text itself presents - and by implication, conceives of — the Buddha Bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabha (who for the sake of convenience will from now on be referred to by the shortened form of Bhaiṣajyaguru). In reading through our text it becomes obvious that an extremely important component in the complex of ideas which is developed around the figure of Bhaiṣajyaguru in *Bhg* concerns the power of his name. (For the Indian background see J. Gonda, *Notes on Names and the Name of God in Ancient India* (Amsterdam: 1970).) It is almost exclusively by means of his name that 'he' becomes available and that the individual gains access to his 'power'. It will, therefore, be convenient for our analysis to concentrate on those

passages which concern the name and the power of the name. Such passages almost always involve two basic factors: 1) an individual in a specific situation, perhaps more correctly, a specific predicament; and 2) the result for that individual which follows from hearing Bhaiṣajyaguru's name. By determining these situations and results we determine the range of Bhaiṣajyaguru's activity and, by extension, we gain a fairly definite idea of his specific character.

An analysis of these passages is most easily presented in schematic form. I give below the material arranged in two columns: in the first, the situations and individuals for which the power of the name was made available; in the second, the end to which the power of the name was to lead.

The name is available

Bhg [2]: for those who live in the 'last period';	to effect the elimination of the obstructions arising from karma.
Bhg [5.5]: for those who have failed in morality,	to prevent unfortunate rebirth.
Bhg [5.6]: for those who are lame, hump-backed, diseased, crippled;	to effect their coming to be such as have all their faculties and fully formed limbs.
Bhg [5.7]: for those who are sick and without refuge or medicine; helpless, poor;	to allay all diseases, restore health and avoid calamities.
Bhg [5.8]: for women who desire to free themselves from existence as a woman;	to ensure that this will be their last existence as a woman.
*Bhg [5.10]: for those terrorized by kings, jailed, condemned to death, etc.;	to deliver them from such calamities.
*Bhg [5.11]: for those who, because of hunger and thirst, do evil;	to effect their provision with food and satisfy their bodies.
*Bhg [5.12]: for those who are naked, poor, troubled by heat, cold, flies, etc.;	to effect their provision with clothes and luxuries.

Bhg [7]: for those who, from stinginess and the non-giving of gifts, are reborn in the world of ghosts or among animals;	to effect their rebirth among men and the obtainment there of 're-collection of former births', on account of which - from fear of another unfortunate rebirth - they will practise giving.
Bhg [8]: for those who undertake the rules of training, but fail in morality, views, etc.; or who guard morality, but do not seek great learning; or who have 'great learning' but are proud on account of it - all of whom are reborn in hell;	to effect their rebirth among men and their being there of correct views, vigorous, etc. and their obtainment, after having gone forth, of the practice of the bodhisattva.
Bhg [9]: for those who praise themselves and berate others and as a consequence are first reborn in the hells, then among beasts of burden or inferior families or into slavery;	to effect their release from all suffering and their coming to be wise, distinguished, intent on roots of merit; their cutting of the snares of Māra, their escape from old age, suffering, etc.
Bhg [10]: for those who are the object of attack by boastful and hateful persons who through compulsion of various devatās, bloody worship of yakṣas, rites of black magic, etc., try to cause obstruction to life or destruction of the body;	to effect protection from such obstruction and dwelling in a state of friendliness towards all.
Bhg [11]: for monks, nuns, laymen and women and others who have undertaken the 8 part fast and upheld the rules of training, all of whom apply their roots of merit to rebirth in Sukhāvatī;	to effect that rebirth in Sukhāvatī, or in a deva-world, or among men as kings, or in rich and high status families.
Bhg [12]: for women;	to ensure that this is their last existence as a woman.

Bhg [13]: for believing sons or daughters of good family in the last time;	to preserve them from untimely death and from any deprivation of vital warmth.
*Bhg [15]: for believing sons or daughthers of good family who uphold the 3-fold refuge, for those who uphold the 5 or 10 rules of training, the 400 rules of the bodhisattva, the 250 rules of a monk or 500 of a nun, but who fail in one or another of these rules and therefore fear rebirth in an unfortunate destiny or hell;	to avoid the suffering of the 3 unfortunate destinies.
*Bhg [15]: for a woman experiencing pain in childbirth;	to effect a quick delivery and the birth of a beautiful, healthy, etc. son.
Bhg [16]: for whoever hears the name;	to prevent any unfortunate rebirth.
*Bhg [17], **[18]: for one at the moment of death;	to ensure an immediate 'return' or a 'return' within 49 days, in which state he will be conscious of his previous experience and will thus avoid doing bad karma.
Bhg [21]: for the yakṣa-generals;	to remove the fear of unfortunate destinies.
Bhg [21]: for those who preserve the name;	to gain protection, release from all calamities, fulfillment of all wishes at the hands of the yakṣa-generals.

[*: the effect is ascribed to the agency of the name only in Redaction B; **: the effect is ascribed to the agency of the name only in Tib. On both see Introduction "On the Redactional Differences in the Gilgit Mss. of Bhg."]

If, as we stated above, we can determine the range of Bhaiṣajyaguru's activity, and therefore his basic character, by determining the specific situations in which the power of his name is thought to be potentially operable, then it is very difficult to maintain, in light of the above material, that he was conceived of solely, or *even* primarily, as a Buddha of healing. Of the twenty-one situations described in the text in which the name of Bhaiṣajyaguru is said to be operable, only two, [5.6] and [5.7], appear to be connected with 'healing'. To these two we could possibly also add [13] (untimely deaths - although most, if not all, of these are accidents, not illnesses) and *[15] (difficulties of childbirth). There might also be a temptation to add *[17] and **[18], which concern the individual at the moment of death, but to do so would be to misunderstand the function of the ritual there described. As we will see below this ritual is not intended to 'heal', to revive the dying man, but to ensure that he obtains a direct awareness of the fact of karma.

If the situations developed in the text do not - apart from these few examples - picture Bhaiṣajyaguru as a 'healer', then it is necessary to ask how, in fact, they do picture him. Here it should be noted that the specific situations presented in the text are, on the surface, of a rather heterogeneous character. They have, however, one thing in common: they all involve an individual in a state of anxiety and unease which arises from the actual or potential rebirth confronting him. That in the second case, that of potential rebirth, this anxiety amounts to a fear of death and its consequences is confirmed by the fact that at Bhg [5.5], [5.8], [7], [8], [11], [12], [15] (1st), [16], *[17], **[18], [21] (and probably [5.6] and [9]) hearing the name of Bhaiṣajyaguru is specifically stated to function in such a way as to meet the fears associated with death: it makes possible the prevention of an unfortunate rebirth or ensures an *eventual* good rebirth. That is to say that here *Bhg* pictures Bhaiṣajyaguru as making available, in the form of his name, a means whereby the individual is able to cope with the anxiety associated with death and the predictable consequences of the accumulated mass of his past actions. ***This is his function,*** and this is a very different thing from 'healing'. Although we will have more to say about this later, it should here be stated that by the very way in which the Buddhist 'world' is constructed, death, rebirth, and karma are inextricably interlocked: the primary meaning of a Buddhist death is the 'judgement' which is unavoidably implicit in it; i.e. rebirth. And that texts such as *Bhg* take as a

given this karmatically constructed world is made explicit in Bhg [7], [8], [9], *[17], and **[18] where the 'power' of Bhaiṣajyaguru's name comes into effect *after* the initial death of the individual concerned *and in* the hells, the world of Yama, etc. (i.e. after the results of karma have come into effect.) This, in turn, suggests that it is important to once again emphasize that the concern here is not with death in itself, but with the death-experience as the implementation of the full effects of one's past actions. The ultimate concern, then, is with the consequences of one's karma; death is in this sense only the occasion on which these become fully and finally manifested and come into effect.

If in the above set of situations the name of Bhaiṣajyaguru functions in response to the anxieties and fears connected with death and its consequences, then it is fairly easy to see that the remaining group of situations - [5.7], *[5.11], *[5.12], [10], [13], *[15] (2nd), - also responds to what amounts to the same basic anxiety and fear. These situations too have one thing in common: they are all life-threatening. Here Bhaiṣajyaguru's name functions not to remove the anxiety and fear of the consequences of death by assuring that they might be favorable, but it functions to remove the imminent fact of death and therefore the immediacy of its consequences which cause that anxiety and fear. The first set takes death as a given, as being in some sense already present. The second takes it as at least temporarily avoidable; both, however, respond to the same basic fear.

In light of the material in *Bhg* then, Bhaiṣajyaguru emerges as a figure whose range of activity is in terms of the specific situations highly generalized; he is presented as potentially active in any situation which is connected with the fear of death or the implementation of the effects of one's past actions.

But the reader at Gilgit would not have known Bhaiṣajyaguru from *Bhg* alone. He would also have known him from *Bbp*, and it is *Bbp* which can serve as a check on the picture we have drawn of our Buddha on the basis of *Bhg*. It is significant that *Bbp* appears not only to confirm our characterization, but to extend it in some interesting directions. Here again the function of the nāmadheya may serve as our point of departure.

The first references to the 'power of the name' we find in *Bbp* are concerned with formulating the basic idea. Fol. 1296.4f, Tib 191-5-5f, is a good example:

And moreover, O devaputras, through a former vow Tathāgatas (who have been parinirvāṇed for a thousand years), or who have been parinirvāṇed for even a kalpa, or even for a koṭī of kalpas, as a result of beings worshipping and honoring and causing the construction of relic stūpas (and causing the construction of images) and holding the name [of those Buddhas; ...nāmadheya-grahaṇa-] and preserving and worshipping the Good Law, they [the Tathāgatas], even though situated in various world-spheres, effect their release from all hells, births among animals, (the world of Yama, inopportune times, unfortunate destinies, bad rebirths and downfalls, from all sufferings, until in due order they are fully and completely awakened .....

Here, 'holding the name' is one of several activities on account of which 'Tathāgatas', through the mechanism of a former vow, assure the eventual release of beings from the hells, unfortunate rebirths, etc. (see also fol.1297.2/Tib.192-1-2; 192-3-8). The point to be noted here is that the text is announcing a general pattern of activity which applies to Tathāgatas, plural, as a category. It is, I think, sufficiently obvious that this general pattern fits perfectly in its essentials with the pattern of Bhaiṣajyaguru's activity discovered above and it is reasonable to suspect that Bhaiṣajyaguru is only one of a more general type. Happily enough, *Bbp* explicitly confirms that suspicion. At *Bbp* 192-4-6f Prasenajit says to Mañjuśrī:

> "Who are the Tathāgatas (de dag gaṅ lags) that, because (beings) have merely heard their name (mtshan thos pa tsam daṅ), or worshipped or honored them, will effect the release of those beings, who have done evil, from the hells, and from birth among animals and from the world of Yama, and will effect their going to a good destiny ? In what world-sphere do those (Tathāgatas) live and how are they to be worshipped ?"

Mañjuśrī responds saying 'listen, I will tell you who those Tathāgatas are:' (Skt. names are from Chandra, *Tibetan-Sanskrit Dictionary*.)

> "In the world-sphere Vaiḍūryanirbhāsa a Tathāgata, Arhat, Samyaksaṃbuddha named Bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabha lives, dwells, abides and is teaching dharma; in the world-sphere gtsug phud can (Śikhaṇin) a Tathāgata, Arhat, Samyaksaṃbuddha named rin po che'i gtsug phud can (*Ratnaśikhaṇin) is; in the world-sphere

dri ma med a Tathāgata ... named dri ma med par 'byuṅ ba; in the world-sphere źi ba a Tathāgata ... named rab tu źi ba bkod pa; in the world-sphere Sukhāvatī a Tathāgata ... named Amitābha; (then follow Tathāgatas named pa mo 'byin ba, rdo rje mkhregs pa (Akṣobhyaprajñābha), mya ṅan bral ba (Vigataśoka), 'jigs pa thams cad rab tu źi bar mdzad pa, etc. up to:) in the world-sphere dbaṅ po there is a Tathāgata named dbaṅ po'i blo gros; through only preserving his name (de'i mtshan bzuṅ ba ñid kyis) one comes to be the leader of devas; in the world-sphere zla ba there is a Tathāgata named zla ba rgyas pa dri ma med pa; through worshipping and preserving his name (de'i mtshan bzuṅ źiṅ mchod pas) one comes to be freed from all impurities; in the world-sphere khyad par thob pa there is a Tathāgata named ṅan 'gro thams cad źi bar mdzad pa; through worshipping and preserving his name one comes to be freed from all unfortunate destinies; in the world-sphere legs par snaṅ ba there is a Tathāgata named sems can thams cad sdug par mthoṅ ba; through worshipping and preserving his name one comes to enjoy all worlds; O Son of good family, in brief, the Tathāgatas dga' ba'i dpa, tsan dan dpal (Candanaśrī), dpa' bo (Śūra), bdud thams cad kyi stobs rab tu 'joms pa, gtsug phud can (Śikhin), thams cad skyob (Viśvabhū), log par dad sel (Krakucchanda), gser thub (Kanakamuni), 'od sruṅ (Kāśyapa) -- O Great King, on account of preserving the name of these Buddhas, Blessed Ones, who have been parinirvāṇed for hundreds of millions of years, or parinirvāṇed for hundreds of kalpas, on account of having had made (for them) relic-stūpas, paintings and images, and worshipping and honoring them with lamps and perfumes and flowers and scents and unguents, and preserving their teaching, and on account of penances and austerities and obligations and fasts, these Tathāgatas effect the release of all beings from all bad rebirths and unfortunate destinies. Purifying the obstructions of karma which persist for kalpas, the five acts with immediate retribution, etc.; having gone to fortunate destinies and not having gone to unfortunate destinies, in due course they will fully and completely awaken to utmost, right and perfect awakening."

This passage, then, appears to make explicit what we had already suspected: that Bhaiṣajyaguru at Gilgit would have been seen as one of a category of Buddhas which included, among others, Amitābha and the previous 'historical' Buddhas, Kāśyapa, Śikhin, all of whom made the effects of a former vow potentially available through the instrumentality of, importantly, the power of their name; and who functioned, in this sense, primarily in situations connected with the fear of death, and above all, the fear of the karmatic consequence of death, i.e. future states of rebirth. Here again, and perhaps even more than in *Bhg*, the power of the name is presented as coming into effect *after* the initial death of the individual concerned *and in* the hells, the world of Yama, etc.

We can also cite a few additional passages from at least one other Gilgit text which indicates that there are still other Buddhas who were, or could be, conceived of as belonging to this type. Perhaps some of the most interesting passages in this regard come from the *Ajitasena-vyākaraṇanirdeśa-sūtra*

Aj: GBMs ix 2343.4-2345.4; GMs i 105.13-106.17:

yo lokanāthasya hi nāmu (yaḥ) śruṇe
    saṃsāraduḥkhā vinirmuktu so naro
apāyagāmī na kadāci bhe[ṣyate]
    svargaṃ ca so yāsyati śīghram evaṃ //
yo lokanāthasya hi nāmu yaḥ śruṇe
    dṛḍhapratijño bahukalpakoṭibhiḥ
mahānubhāvo sugato mahātmanaḥ
    kalpāna koṭyo nayutān acintiyān
so bodhisatvo sthita gaṃgavālukā
    na kadāci so gacchati durgatī bhayam //
yo lokanāthasya hi nāmu yaḥ śruṇe
    apāyagāmī na kadāci bheṣyate
kalpāna koṭīnayutā acintiyā
    rāja sa bhoti sada cakravartī //
yo lokanāthasya [hi] nāmu dhārayet
    yat kiṃci pūrvaṃ sada pāpu yat kṛtaṃ
sarvaṃ kṣayaṃ yāsya[ti]xxmat
    śakropi devendru mahānubhāvo
kalpāna koṭīnayutān acintayā //

sukhāvatiṃ gacchati buddhakṣetraṃ
paryaṃkabaddho sada bodhisatvo
brahmasvaro susvaru maṃjughoṣa
bhavanti varṣāṇa sahasrakoṭibhiḥ //
apāyagāmī na kadāci bheṣyate
yo lokanāthasya hi nāmu dhārayet //

[It is fairly certain that one or more padas have dropped out of some of these gāthās. I have therefore 'punctuated' the text, by means of double daṇḍas, in accordance with what seemed to me the sense, and not in accordance with the metrical structure.]

Whosoever would hear the name of the Lord of the World, that man would be freed from the suffering of Saṃsāra; he will never be one who goes to an unfortunate state; but he will thus go quickly to heaven.

Whosoever would hear the name of the Lord of the World - he who is firm in his promise through many koṭīs of kalpas, one having great might, a Sugata, eminent - that bodhisattva, (though) he remain for unthinkable koṭīs of nayutas of kalpas similar to the sands of the Ganges, he never goes to an unfortunate destiny (or to a state of) fear.

Whosoever would hear the name of the Lord of the World will never be one who goes to an unfortunate state; for unthinkable koṭīs of nayutas of kalpas, he is always a wheel-turning king.

Indeed, who would preserve the name of the Lord of the World, always whatsoever is the bad which was formerly done, all that will be exhausted ... Moreover, he (will be) Śakra, the leader of devas, having great might for unthinkable koṭīs of nayutas of kalpas.

He goes to the buddhafield Sukhāvatī always [as] a bodhisattva sitting cross-legged; for thousands of koṭīs of years he comes to be one having the voice of Brahma, a fine voice, having a charming sound.

He will never be one who goes to an unfortunate

state, (he) who would preserve the name of the Lord of the World.

Aj: GBMs ix 2353.3-2355.6; GMs i 109.9-110.20

avaśya m[e] pūrvakṛtena ka[r]maṇā
    yenāhaṃ jā[tu] daridrake gṛhe
karohi (kā)ruṇyu mamaṃ hi duḥkhitā
    vi(ni)v(ar)[ta]ya narakā hi pālā:
karohi kāruṇyu mamaṃ hi duḥkhitāya
    istribhāvā upapannu nāyakā
    ...   ...
kṛtaṃ hi nātha praṇidhim tvayā hi
    ye keci satvā iha jaṃbudvīpe
tiṣṭhaṃti ye vai daśasu diśāsu
    satvā hi sarve sukhitā [kari]ṣye
    ...   ...
ye kecit satvā iha jaṃbudvīpe
    nāmaṃ ca vai dhāraya paścakāle
parinirvṛtasya tata paścakāle
    bhaviṣyate śāsanavipralopaṃ
yatkiṃci pāpaṃ tada pūrvu yat kṛtaṃ
    sarvaṃ kṣayaṃ yāsyati śīghraṃ e[ta]t

Inevitably, by an act which was done formerly by me I am born in a poor household. Have compassion on my state of suffering ! Turn (me) back from hell, indeed protect (me)!(?) O Leader, have compassion towards my state of suffering, being reborn as a woman!

...   ...

Indeed, O Lord, the vow was made by you: 'whichsoever are the beings here in Jambudvīpa, or which are they that abide in the ten directions - all those beings I will indeed make happy'

..   ...

Whatsoever being here in Jambudvīpa would in the last time preserve (your) name, in the last time when there will be a crumbling of the teaching after (you) are parinirvāṇed, then whatsoever is the evil which

was formerly done (by him), all that will be quickly exhausted.

Both of these passages are presenting a Buddha which has all the characteristics of our type. It is therefore of considerable interest that the lokanātha, the Buddha, who is here being described is in fact the Buddha Śākyamuni. As he is presented here there is nothing to differentiate him in his basic features from Bhaiṣajyaguru, from Amitābha - at least as this latter appears at Gilgit - and from the whole list of Buddhas found in *Bbp*.

Although other examples could be cited - notably *ŚmD* 95.3-97.15 - I think it is sufficiently clear from *Bbp* and *Aj* that Bhaiṣajyaguru does not appear at Gilgit as an isolated individual. The reader at Gilgit would have been forced, by virtue of the passage in *Bbp*, to see him as one of a large category of religious figures - in this case Buddhas - all of whom had a certain number of defining characteristics in common. These defining characteristics, if we may summarize here, present a Buddha with the following features: 1) He, or rather, the effect of his vow, is potentially available through a broad category of religious activities undertaken in reference to him; prominent among these activities is the ritualized recollection - whether verbal or mental - of his name. 2) This vow is potentially available in, and responds to, a broad category of situations which have in common the fear of death and the 'judgement' implicit in death. 3) This potential availability functions to assure, negatively, the avoidance of an unfortunate rebirth, or, positively, the achievement of an auspicious rebirth, or, finally, the temporary avoidance of any rebirth at all. This latter again has both a positive and negative aspect. In the former it may function to provide the individual with goods, wealth, etc. [5.11], [5.12]; that is to say, with those things which reduce the constant potential life-threat of his environment, (poverty, starvation, etc., and, what is more typically Buddhist, the possibility of doing evil on account of poverty, etc.). In its negative aspect it may function to remove the possibility, usually presented as imminent, of accidental or violent or 'unnatural' death. Finally, 4) this potential availability is based on a prior assurance, usually in the form of a formalized declaration to the effect that 'if this is done, that will follow'.

There are, of course, other figures in Gilgit literature besides these Buddhas. These others are primarily bodhisattvas, the most important of which is, without a doubt, Avalokiteśvara. It will not be without interest to look at the way in which these figures - particularly Avalokita - are presented. There are two texts at Gilgit which are almost entirely devoted to the figure of Avalokiteśvara, the *Kāraṇḍavyūha* and the 24th chapter of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*. We might look briefly at both of these, the latter first.

The prose section of *SP* chapter 24 (*SP* 304.1-305.20; 286.1-15; Kern 438-46) begins, after the introductory question as to why Avalokita is so called, with a general statement: 'Here, O Son of good family, as many as are the hundreds of thousands of koṭīs of niyutas of beings who undergo suffering (duḥkhāni pratyanubhavanti), if they would hear the name (nāmadheyaṃ śṛṇuyus) of Avalokiteśvara, the bodhisattva, mahāsattva, they all would be released from that aggregate of suffering (duḥkhaskandhāt)'. This statement introduces both the general theme and the basic vocabulary which will be developed throughout the chapter. In effect, the remainder of the text is taken up almost solely with making the meaning of the general statement's 'duḥkhāni' more specific by enumerating a series of situations in which hearing the name of or 'invoking' (ākrandaṃ kuryāt) Avalokita has a beneficial result. Here already we can see parallelisms with the treatment of Bhaiṣajyaguru in *Bhg*, both in the method of characterization by means of the situations in which he is thought to be operable, and in the fact that 'he' is presented as available primarily through the power of his name. But if we look at the specific situations it will be clear that the parallelism goes considerably beyond this. All of the situations are presented through a more or less standard formula: if an individual is in such and such a situation, and if he then hears or pronounces the name of, or invokes Avalokita, the otherwise predictable consequence of the situation will not result. Almost all the situations have the same predictable consequence: death. They are almost all what I have previously called life-threatening situations. The threat is by fire: mahaty agniskandhe prapateyuḥ; by water: nadībhir uhyamānā, or shipwreck; by execution: vadhyotsṛṣṭo; by yakṣas and rakṣas; by fetters and shackles: haḍinigaḍa; by cheats, enemies and thieves: dhūrtair amitraiś cauraiś ca. In these situations Avalokita responds to a fear of death; but that the essential component in the fear of death is, again, the fear of the 'judgement' implicit in it, is suggested by the next three items

or situations enumerated in the text: 'which beings, O Son of good family, have acted from passion, they, after having done homage to Avalokiteśvara, the bodhisattva, mahāsattva, are freed of passion (ye kulaputra rāgacaritāḥ sattvāḥ te 'valokiteśvarasya bodhisattvasya mahāsattvasya namaskāraṃ kṛtvā vigatarāgā bhavanti); the same formula is then used for dveṣacaritāḥ and mohacaritāḥ. The final situation given in the prose concerns a woman who desires a son or daughter who does homage to Avalokita and as a consequence brings forth either a son or daughter who is lovely, beautiful, and who has 'planted the roots of merit' (avaropitakuśalamūla).

The verse portion of Ch. 24, rather than being a versified version of the preceding prose, appears as if it might instead be an independent text treating the same material. It begins with Akṣayamati saying to someone named Citradhvaja, in response to the latter's question as to why Avalokita is so called:

> śṛnu carā[m] avalokite[śvare // 2 //
> bahukalpaśatā a]cintiyā
> bahubuddhāna sahasrakoṭibhiḥ
> praṇidhānu yathā viśodhitas
> tata śṛṇuyanto mama pradesato // 3 //
> śravaṇo atha darśano pi ca
> anupūrvaṃ ca tathā anusmṛtiḥ
> bhavatīha amogha prāṇināṃ
> sarvaduḥkhabh[a]y[a][śokanāśakaḥ // 4 //

This passage is not free of ambiguity, but I think it might be translated something like this:

> Listen to the conduct of Avalokiteśvara ! // 2 //
> Hear now from my description how for many
> unthinkable hundreds of kalpas under many thousands
> of koṭis of Buddhas [he] refined his vow ! // 3 //
> Surely hearing, and also seeing, and so to
> successively recollecting [this] is here for
> living things an unfailing [source for the]
> elimination of all suffering, fear and anxiety // 4 //

Then follows in a manner similar to the prose a list of specific situations expressed in the formula: 'If a man finds himself in such and such a

situation, then 'calling to mind Avalokita' (smarato avalokiteśvaraṃ), the otherwise predictable consequences of the situation will be avoided'. Again, the situations are all life-threatening, the t[illegible] being from fire: agnikhadāya pātayed; water: sāgaradurgi pātayen; falling: meruṭalātu pātayed; storm: vajrāmaya parvato, vidyu and vajra; enemies: śatrugaṇaiḥ parīvṛtaḥ; execution: vadhyaghātana; fetters and shackles: haḍinigaḍa; witchcraft: mantra, vidya, vetāla; rakṣas, etc. who take away one's vital warmth: ojaharaiḥ parīvṛto yakṣanā[gās]u[rabhūtarakṣasaiḥ]; fearful beasts: vyālamṛgaiḥ mahābhayaiḥ; and poisonous snakes: dṛṣṭiviṣa. This enumeration is then concluded with another general statement:

> sarvatra daśaddiśe jage
> sarvakṣetreṣu aśeṣa dṛśyate // 18 //
> ye a[kṣaṇa][durgatībhayā
> naraka]tirya[g]yamasya śāsane
> jātījaravyādhipīḍitā
> anupūrvaṃ praśamanti prāṇinām // 19 //

> Everywhere in the ten directions in the world,
> everywhere in all fields he shows himself, [and] //18//
> which, for living things, are the fears of inopportune
> times [for rebirth], or of unfortunate rebirth in the
> sphere of the hells or among animals or of Yama,
> [and which are] the afflictions of birth, old age
> and disease, [these] are in due order allayed.

It is not difficult to arrive at a general characterization of Avalokita on the basis of this material. As a matter of fact, such a characterization is expressly formulated by Vs.25; Avalokita: maraṇe vyasane upadrave / trāṇu bhoti śaraṇaṃ parāyaṇam: 'in death, in disaster, in calamity, is the protector, refuge and recourse'. But this characterization, as we already know, is not specific to Avalokita in the Buddhism of Gilgit. Characterized in this way, he appears as only another example of a much larger group, one example of, in fact, the typified Buddha-figure we have noted above. All the defining characteristics are here: 1) He, or again, the effect of his 'vow', is potentially available through religious activity undertaken in regard to him - here, again there is a decided emphasis on recollection or hearing of his name; 2) this 'vow'

is potentially available in, and responds to, a broad category of situations which have in common the fear of death and the judgement implicit in it; 3) this potential availability functions - in this case overwhelmingly - to remove the possibility of imminent accidental or violent death; and 4) this potential availability is based on a prior assurance, although we are here told very little about this. But there is even more: the shared characteristics of Avalokita and our type, especially more clearly delineated members of our type, go considerably beyond just these general definitional features. For example, at least four of the situations or sets of fears responded to by Bhaiṣajyaguru have an almost exact correspondent (although not necessarily verbally 'exact') in the situations responded to by Avalokita: *Bhg* [5.10]: execution; *Bhg* [10]: witchcraft; and *Bhg* [15]: childbirth. The fourth correspondent in *Bhg* is perhaps the most interesting. At *Bhg* [14] we find a list of kinds of fears (bhaya) the removal of which is to be effected by undertaking the ritual activities detailed at the beginning of that section; at *Bhg* [13] it is stated of those who preserve the *Bhg*, the name of Bhaiṣajyaguru, etc.: "Not for them will there be an untimely death", and at *Bhg* [20] a list of these "untimely deaths" is given. The significant point here is that the list of what *Bhg* [14] calls "fears", and the list of what *Bhg* [20] calls "untimely deaths", and the lists of situations given by both the prose and verse of *SP* as those to which Avalokita responds, are all only variant forms of a single more or less standardized list of basic human fears. This list, as we will see below, has a wide distribution in the literature of Gilgit, but for the moment we need only note one thing: in addition to the fact that Avalokita has all the definitional features of our Buddha-type, virtually all the *specific* situational responses which *SP* ascribes to Avalokita are also ascribed in *Bhg* to Bhaiṣajyaguru. They are in this respect functionally interchangeable, and this functional interchangeability is explicitly expressed *in the vocabulary available to it* by *SP* itself:

> "Who, O son of good family, will do homage to the bodhisattva, mahāsattva, Avalokiteśvara, and will preserve his name; and who will do homage to Buddhas, Blessed Ones, equal in number to the sands of sixty-two Ganges rivers, and will preserve their names; and who will do pūjā with robes, alms bowls, couches, seats, and medicines for the sick to as many as are Buddhas, Blessed Ones, (who are now) standing, abiding, dwelling - what do you think, son of good family, would that son or daughter of good family,

on account of that, generate an accumulation of merit ?'

When that was said, the bodhisattva, mahāsattva, Akṣayamati said this to the Blessed One: 'Great, O Blessed One! Great, O Sugata! That son or daughter of good family on account of that would generate a great accumulation'.

The Blessed One said: 'O son of good family, which, after having done homage to so many Buddhas, Blessed Ones, is the accumulation of merit, and which (is the accumulation of he who) would do even a single act of homage to Avalokiteśvara, the bodhisattva, mahāsattva, and would preserve his name - in both cases the accumulation of merit would be the same, not unequal, not different'.

Here we must state an obvious, but also an important point. The characterization which defined a particular type or conception of a Buddha in *Bhg*, *Bbp*, *Aj*, and elsewhere at Gilgit, is in *SP* XXIV found applied not to a Buddha, but to a bodhisattva. That is to say, potential membership in the type has been extended or broadened to include 'individuals' of a supposedly different order. We must also note that not only are the characteristics attributed to Bhaiṣajyaguru not specific to him, they are not even specific to Buddhas as a group. The *Kāraṇḍavyūha*, I think, only deepens these impressions.

Since *Kv* is a much longer and more elaborate text than the Avalokita chapter in *SP*, and since it is riddled with textual problems, I will not treat it in detail. For our purposes it is important to note that by far the greater part of its narrative portion is given over to describing the movement of Avalokita through various hells and spheres of non-human birth - including an outhouse in Benares. The passage concerning this last visit deserves to be quoted in any serious study of Buddhism. In addition to this, it is short and yet a good example of the pattern of activity ascribed to Avalokita in *Kv*.

Kv 281.24-32; GBMs vii, fol. 1603R.

Then Ārya-Avalokiteśvara, the bodhisattva, mahāsattva, having departed from Siṃhaladvīpa, went to an outhouse in the great city of Vārāṇasi where many thousands of insects lived. Then Avalokiteśvara, the bodhisattva, mahāsattva, having approached, having seen there those thousands of living things, having transformed

himself into the form of a buzzing bee, then to those (insects) the sound 'namo buddhāya namo dharmāya namaḥ saṃghāya' was manifested (from that buzzing). Having heard that, all those living things are made to recollect the name (iti nāmam anusmārayanti) 'namo buddhāya namo dharmāya namaḥ saṃghāya'. And all of them, through only recollecting the name of the Buddha (buddhanāmasmaraṇamātreṇa), having smashed with the vajra of knowledge the mountain of the view of a real individuality which arose with twenty peaks (viṃśatiśikharasamudgataṃ satkāyadṛṣṭiśailam; cf. Burnouf, *Introduction a l'histoire du bouddhisme indien,* deuxième éd. (Paris: 1876) 235 n.2, 242), they all were reborn in the world-sphere Sukhāvatī as bodhisattvas named ' Sweet Smelling Mouth'. They all, in the presence of the Blessed One Amitābha, the Tathāgata, having heard the Mahāyāna [Sūtra] named *Kāraṇḍavyūha,* and having rejoiced, in various directions their prediction was obtained.

As I have said above this is a good example of the kind of activity ascribed to Avalokita in *Kv*. The same basic pattern of activity recurs in the accounts of his visits to one sphere of non-human birth after another (Avīcinaraka (260.32f.), pretaloka (263.15f), Siṃhaladvīpa, the home of fierce rakṣas, etc.). This aspect of Avalokita is summed up in the text when Bali, the leader of the Asuras says to him: sukhitās te sattvā ye tava nāmadheyam anusmaranti. mucyante te kārasūtrarauravopapanneṣu avīcyupapanneṣu pretanagaropapanneṣu ye tava nāmadheyam anusmaranti. mucyante te bahavaḥ pāpaduḥkhāt. sucetanās te sattvā ye tava nāmadheyam anusmaranti. gacchanti te sukhāvatīlokadhātum. amitābhasya tathāgatasya dharmam anusmaranti śṛṇvanti: 'Happy are those beings who recollect your name. Those having been reborn in the Kālasūtra (hell) and the Raurava (hell), in the Avīci (hell) and in the city of Pretas who recollect your name are freed. They are freed from much suffering due to evil. Well-minded are those beings who recollect your name. They go to the world-sphere Sukhāvatī. They recollect, they listen to dharma from Amitābha, the Tathāgata' (*Kv* 275.19; GBMs vii, fol.1597L). In all these passages the power of the name of Avalokita, like that of Bhaiṣajyaguru at *Bhg* [7], [8], [9], [17], and [18], and that of the Buddhas grouped together at *Bbp* 192-4-6f, comes into effect after the initial death of the individual concerned and in the hells, world of Pretas, etc.

It is, perhaps, unnecessary to go into further details here, except to note that *Kv*, like *SP*, explicitly states that Avalokita - like our category of Buddhas - is available through, primarily, the power of his name by virtue of a vow (dṛḍhapratijñā). This vow is expressed twice in *Kv*, na ca tāvat tvayānuttarā samyaksaṃbodhir abhisaṃboddhavyā, yāvat samantād daśabhyo digbhyaḥ sarvākṣaṇopapannāḥ sattvā ārūpaviśeṣe nirvāṇa-dhātau na pratiṣṭhāpitā bhaveyuh, at 266.26, and in very similar terms at 268.11.

But the story does not end here. If the Avalokita of *SP* XXIV and *Kv* is presented in such a way that he is both structurally and functionally identical with Bhaiṣajyaguru, the Buddhas of *Bbp*, the Śākyamuni of *Aj*, etc., the same is true of the Avalokita of *StA* (66.7f) and *EKA*, the bodhisattva Vajrapāṇi (*StA* 57.4f), the Mahāyakṣiṇī Anopamā (*StA* 71.1f), the Mahādevīs Śaṅkhinī (*StA* 74.3f) and Bhīmā (*StA* 75.7f), etc. These figures, though some are less extensively developed than others, all present the same basic features. This is true even if occasionally these features appear in a slightly different form. Both Avalokita and Bhīmā, for example, are presented as potentially available both through a vow and an 'act of truth' (satyādhiṣṭhāna). This appears to be a new element, but as we will see below these two conceptions are, if not identical, closely related phenomena. Further, almost all the figures in *StA* are available not through the 'recollection' of their name, but through what is there usually called a mantrapada. That these mantrapadas are the functional equivalent of the nāmadheya will, however, be clear when the rituals they are embedded in are discussed below. There it will also be clear that they are not the meaningless (to us) strings of syllables common in tantric mantras. They are, in fact, invocatory prayers in which the name plays a very prominent part.

What all this means here is that in attempting to characterize Bhaiṣajyaguru, we have come upon a major type, perhaps *the* major type for the religious figure at Gilgit. That what we have here is a type is, I think, beyond doubt. All these figures - whether Buddha, bodhisattva, or deva - share a basic identity of structure and an essential sameness of function. We have already described the defining characteristics of the type (see above p.139) so that here I think we need add only one thing. With one exception, the individual members of our type are the only figures in Gilgit literature who are the objects of religious activity, and therefore the only ones who could form a part of the

individual's daily experience and with whom he could interact. That is to say, if I may adapt an important distinction from Gombrich (*Precept and Practice, Traditional Buddhism in the Rural Highlands of Ceylon* (Oxford: 1971) 157f), they constitute the actual as opposed to the ideal 'pantheon' of the Buddhism of Gilgit. This is underscored by the fact that the individual at Gilgit had access to specified patterns of approach and interaction with only these figures. These patterns of approach and interaction - as we will see below - constitute the ritual complex current at Gilgit.

c. This leaves the problem of our one exception: Śākyamuni. That there was a cult of Śākyamuni at Gilgit seems almost certain. As a matter of fact there appear to have been *at least* two major forms of cult associated with him, and, if I am not mistaken, these two forms are in turn associated one with the Hīnayāna, the other with the Mahāyāna.

The Hīnayāna cult of Śākyamuni is developed most clearly at Gilgit in, oddly enough, the *Maitreyavyākaraṇa*. Although I cannot here give my argument, I think it is fairly certain that the *Maitreyavyākaraṇa* is a Hīnayāna text. This is not as surprizing as it might first appear since there are a number of other Hīnayāna texts, in addition to the Vinaya, found at Gilgit (the *Adbhutadharmaparyāya* (GBMs vii fol.1507.8 to end, and fols. 1576.1-1581.4; fol.1691.2 to end; fols.1588.1 to 1592.4; the latter is mislabelled, by the scribe, as the *Kūṭāgāra-sūtra*), the *Deva-sūtra* (GBMs vii 1542.5f), the *Svalpade[illegible]ṭā-sūtra* (GBMs vii 1545.3f), the *Āyuṣparyanta-sūtra* etc., etc.. None of these texts has been previously identified and they remain for the time being unedited. I hope in the not too distant future to publish an edition of at least some of them together with a detailed discussion of their 'school' affiliation.) I mention all this here because it is important to take into account the probable tradition to which the *Maitreyavyākaraṇa* belongs in discussing its conception of Śākyamuni, since this affiliation is able to explain a number of otherwise possibly puzzling factors. It should also be noted that the text of the passage from *Mvk* that I give below differs sometimes considerably from that found in Majumder's edition. Here again I cannot give the detailed arguments which support my readings. They will be found in a paper entitled "Text-Critical Notes on the Gilgit Redaction of the *Maitreyavyākaraṇa*" which I hope to publish in the near future.

The passage in *Mvk* in which the conception of Śākyamuni is most fully developed is also doctrinally the core of the whole text. The setting is this: it is the time of the future Buddha Maitreya; he has just attained awakening and he is about to give his teaching to all those who at that time will be assembled to hear him; i.e., to those who will have acquired enough merit to be reborn at the time of the appearance of the Buddha Maitreya.

Mvk: GBMs vii 1538.8-1539.7; GMs iv 205.3-207.12; Lévi 387.21-388.6:

supuṣpite 'sminn udyāne sannipāto bhaviṣyati
samaṃtato yojanaśataṃ parṣat tasya bhaviṣyati //
tato kāruṇikaḥ śāstā maitreyaḥ puruṣottamaḥ
samitiṃ vyavalokyātha imam arthaṃ pravakṣyati //
sarve me śākyasiṃhena gaṇiśreṣṭhena tāyinā
arthato lokanāthena parīttā bhūrimedhasā //
cchatradhvajapatākābhir gandhamālyavilepanaiḥ
kṛtvā stūpeṣu satkāram āgatā hi mamāṃtikaṃ [Lévi: kṛtvā śākyamuneḥ pūjāṃ hy āgatā mama śāsane] //
saṃghe datvā ca dānāni cīvaraṃ pānabhojanaṃ
vividhaṃ glānabhaiṣajyaṃ āgatā hi mamāṃtikaṃ //
kuṃkumodakasekaṃ ca candanenānulepanaṃ
datvā śākyamuneḥ stūpeṣv āgatā hi mamāntikaṃ //
śikṣāpadāni cādāya śākyasiṃhasya śāsane [Lévi: śākyamuniśāsane]
paripālya yathābhūtam āgatā hi mamāntikaṃ //
upoṣadhaṃ upoṣyeha āryaṃ aṣṭāṅgikaṃ śubhaṃ
caturdaśīṃ pañcadaśīṃ pakṣasyehāṣṭamīṃ tathā //
prātihārikapakṣaṃ cāpy aṣṭāṅgaṃ susamāhitaṃ
śīlāni ca samādāya saṃprāptā mama śāsanaṃ //
buddhaṃ dharmaṃ ca saṃghaṃ ca satve te śaraṇaṃ gatāḥ
kṛtvā ca kuśalaṃ karma macchāsanam upāgatāḥ //
tenaite preṣitāḥ satvā pratīṣṭāś ca mayāpy amī
gaṇiśreṣṭhena muninā parīttā bhūrimedhasā //
prasannāṃ janatāṃ dṛṣṭvā satyāni kathayiṣyati
śrutvā ca te tato dharmaṃ prāpsyaṃti padam uttamaṃ //
prātihāryatrayeṇāsau śrāvakān vinayiṣyati
sarve te āsravāṃ tatra kṣapayiṣyanti suratāḥ //

In that park (named) Supuṣpita there will be a gathering, and his assembly will be a hundred yojanas all around. //

Then the Compassionate One, the Teacher Maitreya, the Best of Men, having surveyed that gathering, will explain this situation: //

"All (these beings) were indeed entrusted to me by the Lion of the Śākyas, the best of teachers, the Holy One, the Wise and Intelligent Lord of the World //

Having done reverence to the stūpas (of Śākyamuni [Lévi: 'Having done pūjā to Śākyamuni] with umbrellas, flags and banners, with perfumes, garlands and unguents, they indeed have attained to my presence //

Having given gifts to the Sangha, robes, food and drink, various medicines for the sick, they indeed have attained to my presence //

Having given to the stūpas of Śākyamuni a sprinkling with saffron water and a smearing with sandal wood powder, they indeed have attained to my presence //

Having taken on themselves the rules of training in the teaching of the Lion of the Śākyas, having guarded them accordingly, they indeed have attained to my presence //

Having observed here the worthy, auspicious Upoṣadha having eight parts on the fourteenth, the fifteenth, so here on the eighth day of the fortnight; //

And moreover, having taken on themselves (the observance of) 'The Fortnight of Miracles' furnished with eight parts, and the precepts, they have fully attained to my teaching. //

To the Buddha, the Dharma and the Sangha those beings have gone for refuge, and having performed good acts, they have arrived for my teaching. //

By that [i.e. the above meritorious actions] those beings are impelled; and moreover they are accepted by me, being entrusted [to me] by the Best of Teachers, the Wise and Intelligent Muni (i.e. Śākyamuni)". //

Having seen that those people were devout, (Maitreya) will speak on the truths, and they having heard the dharma, will then obtain the best abode. //

Through the three miracles he will discipline the Śrāvakas, and they there, the mild, will effect the destruction of the outflows. //

The conception of Śākyamuni which is developed here is, I think, rather straightforward: religious activity directed toward him, or undertaken in reference to him, results in rebirth in the 'world' of Maitreya. If, then, there is a 'cult' here, it is surely a cult of Śākyamuni; he is the object of worship, not Maitreya. Maitreya is not the cult figure, but the goal. This interpretation receives confirmation from the fact that Śākyamuni is said 'to entrust' those beings who have undertaken religious activity in regard to him *to Maitreya*, and from the fact that the text as a whole concludes with an exhortation to have faith in Śākyamuni, not in Maitreya (prasādayati cittāni tasmāc chākyamunau jine / tato dṛkṣatha maitreyaṃ saṃbuddhaṃ dvipadottamam //.) This view of 'the cult of Maitreya' differs in some important ways from that found in our scholarly sources (e.g. E.Abegg, *Der Messiasglaube in Indien und Iran* (Berlin: 1928) 145-202; J.Przyluski, "La croyance au messie dans l'inde et l'iran", *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* 100 (1929) 1-12; etc.), but in terms of the tradition represented by the *Mvk* - and it is important to note that here my remarks are restricted entirely to it - it is difficult to avoid. The primary source of this difference is the fact that heretofor 'the cult of Maitreya' has been interpreted by means of, and assimilated to, a model or type which in origin is external to the Buddhist context; i.e. the Messiah (usually the Ancient Near Eastern Messiah). It is possible, however, to interpret the data by means of a type which is, in fact, indigenous to the Buddhist world-view, and thus more readily available. This is what, for convenience's sake, might be called the 'paradise cult', the most useful example of which is - although not available at Gilgit in its classical form - the cult of Amitābha. Admitting, even, that the cult of Amitābha is *probably* later than the tradition concerning Maitreya, still as a type it has, for the purpose of interpretation, the great advantage of being discoverable in the Buddhist world. Its application to the data also has in its favor the fact that it can account for at least one important phenomenon which otherwise remains mysterious. Taking it, then, as a model for the interpretation of the material found in *Mvk*, we should first note that in its essential form the 'paradise cult' in general, and the cult of

Amitābha in particular, has a very simple structure: it involves a Buddha towards whom religious activity is undertaken and an assurance that that religious activity will result, through the agency of that Buddha, in a future rebirth in that Buddha's buddhafield, e.g. Sukhāvatī, where ideally the individual will be able to more advantageously pursue the religious life. I think it is sufficiently obvious that the cult presented in the *Mvk* has, *in one form or another*, all these elements: it involves a Buddha (Śākyamuni) towards whom religious activity is undertaken (pūjā done to him or his stūpas, etc.), and an assurance that that religious activity will result, through the agency of that Buddha (Śākyamuni is twice said 'to entrust' the beings involved), in a future rebirth in - let us say, for the moment - a particularly auspicious place (the 'world' of Maitreya), where the individual will be able to more advantageously pursue the religious life (Maitreya will teach his dharma, having heard which, the individual 'will effect the destruction of the outflows', etc.). Clearly there is only one element in the cult of *Mvk* which differs from the typified paradise cult and it involves the fact that the individual in *Mvk* has a future rebirth not in a buddhafield belonging to the cult Buddha, but in a future and ideal state of the present world. Here, I think, is where the affiliation of the *Mvk* becomes significant. *If* it is, as I think it is, a Hīnayāna work, then since we think we know that if the idea of a Buddhafield was present in Hīnayāna literature at all, it was a very late addition (cf. D.Barua, "'Buddhakhetta' in the Apadāna", *B.C.Law Volume*, pt.2 (Poona: 1946) 183-90), it would follow that the author of *Mvk* would not have had access to such an idea. But even if this argument is not entirely accepted, there is still another factor which explains the fact that the individual could not have been reborn in the 'Buddhafield' of Śākyamuni: *he was already in it;* that is to say that the 'Buddhafield' of Śākyamuni was already temporally and spatially present and, therefore, could not be projected into the future. On the other hand, if we assume that the author of *Mvk* wrote at a time prior to the development of the conception of 'buddhafields', then it is obvious that his only alternative was to project the desired rebirth to a future and ideal state of the present world. The *real question* here, however, is whether or not the 'world' of Maitreya is *functionally* identical with Sukhāvatī. I think an affirmative answer is difficult to avoid. The primary and defining characteristics of Sukhāvatī are again rather simple: its temporal situation in regard

to the individual concerned; its physical description; and its conception as an ideal state for religious progress. All three of these characteristics are found with a surprizingly high degree of similarity in the articulation of the 'world' of Maitreya: both are potential states of *future* rebirth; the physical description of Ketumatī, the city of Maitreya, is characterized by the same kind of ornate and rococo elaboration as is found in the description of Sukhāvatī and, perhaps more importantly, the description of Ketumatī is the only thing in Hīnayāna literature which is even vaguely like the full-blown descriptions of buddhafields in Mahāyāna texts, it is perhaps the only thing that could have served as a model for these 'later' descriptions (cf. T.Rowell, "The Background and Early Use of the Buddhakṣetra Concept", *The Eastern Buddhist* 6 (1932-35) 419 and n.1; 7 (1936-39) 169). Finally, both Sukhāvatī and the 'world' of Maitreya are, above all else, presented as ideal states for the pursuance of the religious life. In terms of their defining characteristics, then, Sukhāvatī and the 'world' of Maitreya are in fact functionally, even, physically identical. This functional identity is indirectly confirmed by a passage like that from the *Ajitasenavyākaraṇa* quoted above where religious activity undertaken towards Śākyamuni is explicitly stated to result in rebirth in Sukhāvatī !

In light of all this it seems reasonable to conclude that what we have in the tradition now represented by *Mvk* is a prototypical form of the Mahāyāna 'paradise cult'. The cult here, as we have said above, is not of Maitreya, but Śākyamuni. Maitreya and the 'world' of Maitreya are simply the functional equivalent of what in the fully developed cult is the buddhafield of the cult Buddha. As I have suggested above this interpretation also has the advantage of allowing us to account for at least one other important fact in the development of Buddhist ideas which otherwise remains mysterious. One of the central problems concerning the 'paradise cult' is that it seems to lack - before its full-blown appearance in the cult of Amitābha - a prehistory. It is just here that our interpretation of *Mvk* may be significant. *If* it is accepted that *Mvk* is presenting a prototypical form of the Mahāyāna 'paradise cult', *then* we have in it the otherwise unavailable prehistory for this important Mahāyāna form. Moreoever, we might also be able to conjecturally account for the emergence of the full form. In the cult of Śākyamuni presented in *Mvk* the sought for goal is, of necessity, projected so far into the future that it loses almost all semblance of immediacy, and therefore much of the

functional character of a motive for action. This temporal disadvantage with the 'world' of Maitreya may then have served as the impetus towards the development of ideas concerning the existence of other Buddhas and other buddhafields which existed or could exist simultaneously with Śākyamuni, and therefore could be almost immediately available. This at least is a hypothesis worth testing. For the moment it can simply be noted that both the spatial dimensions and the relative fluidity of Indian cosmological notions could easily be adapted or used in such a development.

Before leaving *Mvk* I think it is necessary to make two further observations. First I began this section with a discussion of the importance of the power of the name for the Buddha Bhaiṣajyaguru and others of his type. The power of the name is not a factor in the cult of Śākyamuni as it appears in *Mvk*. This, however, is to be explained by the probable Hīnayāna and prototypical nature of the tradition which *Mvk* preserves. Again, if present at all, the power of the name in Hīnayāna sources appears not to have been significant. This does not, on the other hand, militate against seeing even in the Śākyamuni of *Mvk* a very close resemblance to other examples of the generalized 'Cult Figure' at Gilgit. For, although this figure is often presented as potentially available through the power of his name, the latter is certainly not the only or exclusive means of realizing this availability. In all the texts so far studied, *Bhg*, *Bbp*, etc., recollection of the name is only one - albeit a very important one - of a list of religious activities undertaken in reference to a specific Buddha to obtain an auspicious rebirth, etc. The list of activities found, for example, in *Bbp* corresponds - apart from recollecting the name - rather closely with that found in *Mvk*. So in spite of this apparent difference the Śākyamuni of *Mvk*, like the Śākyamuni of the *Ajitasenavyākaraṇa*, might also be comfortably classified as one of our larger type. Also in reference to our larger type it is perhaps useful to add here that assurance of an auspicious rebirth - the only concern which is explicitly articulated in *Mvk* - has meaning, once again, primarily as a response to the fear or anxiety connected with death and the consequences of death.

Secondly, it should be obvious that apart from the fact that the general element 'fortunate rebirth' receives a more specific characterization here, the elements which define what I have just been calling

'the Mahāyāna paradise cult' are virtually the same elements as those which define our type. This should not be surprizing since Amitābha, whose cult is the example par excellence of the 'paradise cult', has already been explicitly classified by *Bbp* as one of our type. And it is, I think, this latter classification which finally places the cult of Amitābha, which is usually treated as a more or less distinct and isolated phenomenon in the Buddhist tradition, in its prop. context. I used the expression 'paradise cult' as a provisional designation for a particular configuration of the elements defining our type because it allowed me to highlight clearly certain factors in *Mvk* which I wanted to explain; but it should probably not be taken as anything more than a provisional designation. The structure provisionally described as a 'paradise cult' clearly belongs within our type. At most it could only be further classified as a particular sub-type which has undergone, perhaps, a greater degree of elaboration in regard to one specific element.

This then is at least one form of the Hīnayāna cult of Śākyamuni available at Gilgit. The point to be noted is that in spite of the fact that it appears to represent a less advanced stage in the evolution of Buddhist cult forms, it exhibits the same basic structure - both in its organization and its conception of the cult figure - as do the more fully elaborated and definitely Mahāyāna cults current at Gilgit.

d. Of the Mahāyāna cult of Śākyamuni, or at least that which appears to me to be the major form of it, I can here give only a brief outline. It would appear that the Mahāyāna, in spite of all the theoretics (notably, at Gilgit, in *SP* and *Bbp*), found it very difficult to make the historical Buddha 'presently' available. He had been rather effectively buried by the earlier tradition and this early tradition was a massive presence confronting the Mahāyāna. What was perhaps the earliest attempt to solve this problem was both ingeneous and rooted in the very tradition it was attempting to circumvent. The Mahāyāna, from the very beginning, developed the equation 'the historical Buddha' = the body of his teaching. Developed, but did not invent. This equation is already found in earlier sources in formulas such as yo dhammaṃ passati so bhagavantaṃ passati (for this, and the whole question under discussion see G. Schopen, "The Phrase 'sa pṛthvīpradeśaś caityabhūto bhavet' in the *Vajracchedikā*: Notes on the Cult of the Book in Mahāyāna", *IIJ* 17 (1975) 147-81; although in what follows I will be pursuing a slightly

different tack). The direction this development took may be seen from a series of random quotations

StA 86.7: athāyuṣmān ānando bhagavantam etad avocat: udgṛhītaṃ mayā bhagavan imaṃ dharmaparyāyaṃ śāstṛsaṃjñayā dhārayiṣyāmi pūjayiṣyāmi sarvasattvebhyaḥ saṃprakāśayiṣyāmi.

Then the Venerable Ānanda said this to the Blessed One: 'Received by me, O Blessed One, is this discourse on dharma; with the idea that it is the teacher I will preserve, I will worship it, and I will illuminate it for all beings.'

StA 87.2: tasmāt tarhi tvam (khyod kyis) ānanda satkṛtya ayaṃ dharmaparyāyo dhārayitavyaḥ, ayaṃ te tathāgatasyānuttara-samyaksaṃbodhi, tathāgatakṛtyaṃ kariṣyati paścime kāle paścime samaye sarvasattvānāṃ.

Therefore now, Ānanda, by you, after having honored it, this discourse on dharma is to be preserved; it is for you the utmost, right, and full awakening of the Tathāgata. In the last time, in the last period it will perform the functions of a Tathāgata for all beings.

SP 239.18: dhāreti ya idaṃ sūtraṃ sa dhāreti jinavigrahaṃ: Who preserves this sūtra, he preserves the form of the Jina.

SP 124.25: tathāgataṃ so 'ṃsena parihareta ya imaṃ dharma-paryāyaṃ pustakagataṃ kṛtvā aṃsena parihareta.

He would carry the Tathāgata on his shoulder who, after having made this discourse on dharma into a book, would carry it on his shoulder.

SP 166.26: evam eva ... saddharmapuṇḍarīko dharmaparyāyas tathāgatabhūto bodhisattvayānasamprasthitānāṃ.

Just so ... the discourse on dharma (called) *Saddharma-puṇḍarīka* is the true Tathāgata for those who have set out in the bodhisattva-vehicle.

Vaj 12 (Conze's ed., this passage has not been preserved in the Gilgit Ms.): api tu khalu punaḥ subhūte yasmin pṛthivī-pradeśa ito dharmaparyāyād antaśaś catuṣpādikāṃ api gāthāṃ udgṛhya bhāṣyeta vā samprakāśyeta vā, sa pṛthivīpradeśaś caitya-bhūto bhavet sadevamānuṣāsurasya lokasya, kaḥ punar vādo ya

imaṃ dharmaparyāyaṃ sakalasamāptaṃ dhārayiṣyanti vācayiṣyanti ... parameṇa te subhūte āścaryeṇa samanvāgatā bhaviṣyanti; tasmiṃś ca subhūte pṛthivīpradeśe śāstā viharaty anyatarānyataro vā vijñagurusthānīyaḥ

Moreover, Subhūti, on which spot of earth (someone), after having taken from this discourse on dharma a verse of even four lines, would recite or illuminate it, that spot of earth would become a true shrine for the world with its devas, men, and asuras - how are we to speak of those who would preserve this discourse on dharma in its entirety, would recite it, etc., ... they will be possessed of the highest wonder - and on that spot of earth, Subhūti, the Teacher dwells or someone or other representing the wise Guru.

These passages, taken from three texts of a very different character, are representative of any number of others that we could cite. They all point in the same direction: the dharmaparyāya is to be seen as, performs the function of, is the form of, or simply is not only the Tathāgata, but the *true* Tathāgata. If the dharmaparyāya is present, the Buddha is present and, as is clear from *Vaj* 12 and other passages, the presence of the dharmaparyāya sacralizes the spot where it is found in the same way as the presence of the Buddha does. All of these equations receive confirmation from the fact that in countless texts it is unequivocally stated that one is to behave towards the dharmaparyāya, usually in the form of a book, in the same way that one behaves toward the Buddha: one is to circumambulate it, to worship it with flowers, incense, banners, etc., and it is here, of course, that these ideas became significant for Buddhist cult practice and are of interest in the present context. But what is perhaps of even greater interest for us is the fact that not only did the individual behave towards the dharmaparyāya as he did toward the Buddha and, significantly, toward the category of cult figures we have outlined above, but the dharmaparyāya itself is presented as having most of the characteristic features of our Buddha or the typified cult figure. It is, for example, available through its name. This is especially prominent in *Kv*.

Kv 278.30f, GBMs vii 1600R: ye satataparigrahaṃ kāraṇḍavyūhasya mahāyānasūtraratnarājasya nāmam anusmaranti mucyante te īdṛśāt saṃsārikād duḥkhāt / jātijarāvyādhimaraṇaśokapari-

devanāduḥkhadaurmanasyopāyāsaparimukta bhavanti / yatra yatropapadyante tatra tatra jātau jātau jātismarā bhavanti ... na kadācit yakṣatvaṃ na rākṣasatvaṃ na pretatvaṃ ... na manuṣyadāridryaṃ pratyanubhaviṣyanti ... ye 'pi kecit kulaputrāḥ sattvā asmāt kāraṇḍavyūhamahāyānasūtraratnarājād ekākṣaram api nāmadheyaṃ api catuṣpādikāṃ api gāthāṃ likhāpayiṣyanti teṣāṃ pañcānantaryāṇi karmāṇi niravaśeṣaṃ parikṣayaṃ gamiṣyanti / te cābhirūpā bhaviṣyanti ... teṣāṃ na kaścit kāye vyādhiḥ prabhaviṣyati / na cakṣurogaṃ na śrotrarogaṃ, etc.

Who incessantly recollects the name of the *Kāraṇḍavyūha*, the king of the jewels of the Mahāyāna sūtras, they are freed from such samsaric suffering, they are released from birth, old age, disease, death, sorrow, etc.... wherever they are reborn, there in every birth they are such as remember their former births. Never will they experience the state of a yakṣa or rakṣas or preta... or human poverty... Moreover, whatsoever son of good family, (whatsoever) being will have copied from this king of the jewels of the Mahāyāna sūtras, the *Kāraṇḍavyūha*, a single syllable, or the name, or a verse of four lines, for them the five acts which have immediate retribution will be exhausted without remainder; they will be lovely ... no disease whatever will arise in their body, no affliction of the eye or the ear, etc.

Kv 289.13, GBMs vii 1614R: atha sarvanīvaraṇaviṣkambhī bhagavantam etad avocat: yadā bhagavan kāraṇḍavyūhasya mahāyānasūtraratnarājasya nāma[m] anusmaranti tadābhiprāyā anusidhyanti / yasya nāmadheyamātreṇa īdṛśāni vastūni prādurbhavanti, sukhitās te sattvā ye kāraṇḍavyūhaṃ mahāyānasūtraratnarājaṃ śroṣyanti likhāpayiṣyanti ...

Then Sarvanīvaraṇaviṣkambhin said this to the Blessed One: 'When, O Blessed One, they recollect the name of the *Kāraṇḍavyūha*, the king of the jewels of the Mahāyāna sūtras, then their wishes are fulfilled; through merely its name such things appear. Happy are those beings who will hear the *Kāraṇḍavyūha*, the king of the jewels of the Mahāyāna sūtras, who will have it copied, etc.

More importantly the dharmaparyāya is approached in the same situations or for the same reasons, and fulfills the same function as our typified cult figure. I here give only two examples.

StA 53.5f, GBMs vii 1752.3, Pek. vol. 27, 272-2-1

yadā yad dharmaparyāyaṃ paṃcamaṇḍalena praṇipatya puṣpadhūpagandhamālyavilepanacchatradhvajapatākai samalaṃkṛtya namo buddh(āy)eti kṛtvā namaskariṣyaṃti sādhukāraṃ dāsyaṃti · dhārayiṣyaṃti · vācayiṣyaṃti · vācāpayiṣyaṃti · likhiṣyaṃti · likhāpayiṣyaṃti ... te dṛṣṭa eva dharme sarvaguṇasamanvāgatā bhaviṣyaṃti · abhirūpāḥ ... dīrghāyuṣkā ... candanagandhaṃ cāsya mukhā pravāsyati ... rātṛndivaṃ cāsya buddhabodhisatvadarśanaṃ bhaviṣyati · sarvāvaraṇaṃ cāsya kṣayaṃ yāsyanti · paṃcānantaryaprabhṛtayaḥ kṛtvā devatā cāsya rakṣiṣyaṃti · maraṇakāle cāsya buddhadarśana(ṃ) bodhisatvadarśanaṃ bhaviṣyaṃti · na īrṣyāluko na vikṣepacitta kāla(ṃ) kariṣyati // yāva cyuto sukhāvatyā lokadhātāv upapadyate.

When, having prostrated themselves with the five limbs touching [before that] which is the discourse on dharma *(chos kyi rnam grangs 'di la yan lag lṅas phyag byas śiṅ /)*, having fully adorned it with flowers, incense, perfume, garlands, unguents, umbrellas, flags and banners; having said 'namo buddhāya' *(saṅs rgyas la phyag 'tshal lo źes brjod ciṅ)*, they will honor it, they will give applause to it, they will preserve, recite, cause it to be recited, will write, will cause it to be written ... they here and now will be possessed of all qualities. [They will be] handsome ... long lived ... and the scent of sandal wood will waft from such a one's mouth; and day and night for him there will be a vision of Buddhas and Bodhisattvas; and all his obscurations will be exhausted [even after] having committed the five acts with immediate retribution, etc.; and the devatās will protect them; and at the moment of death there will be visions of the Buddhas, visions of the bodhisattvas; they will not die having envious thoughts, scattered thoughts; up to: having passed away they are reborn in the world-sphere Sukhāvatī.

Sgṭ fol.2122.1f: yaḥ sarvaśūra prasannacittaḥ saṃghāṭam sūtraṃ adhyāśayena namaskariṣyati paṃcanavatikalpāṃ jātau jātismaro bhaviṣyati ṣaṣṭikalpasahasrāṇi rājā cakravartī bhaviṣyati · dṛṣṭeva dharme sarvaśūra sarveṣāṃ priyo bhaviṣyati manāpaḥ na sa sarvaśūra śastreṇa kālaṃ kariṣyati · na viṣeṇa kālaṃ kariṣyati · kākhordaṃ cāsya na kramiṣyati · maraṇakālasamaye carimanirodhe vartamāne navatibuddhakoṭyaḥ sammukhan drakṣyati · te ca sarvaśūra buddhā bhagavanta āśvāsayanti · mā bhaiḥ satpuruṣa tvayā saṃghāṭaṃ sūtraṃ mahādharmaparyāyaṃ subhāṣitaṃ śrutaṃ śrutvā iyā te puṇyaskandhaḥ prasūtaḥ, etc.

Who, O Sarvaśūra, having a devout mind, will wholeheartedly reverence the *Saṃghāṭa Sūtra*, he in every birth for ninety-five kalpas will be such as remembers his former births; for sixty thousand kalpas he will be a cakravartin king. Here and now, Sarvaśūra, he will be dear (and) charming for all. Sarvaśūra, not by the sword will he die. Not by poison will he die. And Kākhordas will not attack him. At the moment of death, when the final suppression occurs, he will see ninety koṭīs of Buddhas face-to-face. And, Sarvaśūra, those Buddhas, Blessed Ones, will encourage him (thus): 'do not be afraid, good man, by you the *Saṃghāṭa Sūtra*, the great and well spoken discourse on dharma was heard; having heard it, this heap of merit was produced for you, etc.'

Here again these references are representative and could easily be multiplied. Enough, however, is given in the above passages to indicate what I wish to establish. The dharmaparyāya-Buddha - and this is, I think, a good way of indicating the cult-object here - is approached in the same way, is the object of the same patterns of behavior as are directed towards our typified cult-figure. The dharmaparyāya-Buddha is available through its name or through other forms of religious activity undertaken in regard to it, pūjā, etc. The power of the dharmaparyāya-Buddha is presented as potentially available in situations which are, above all, concerned with death, dying, karma and rebirth; and that power functions to provide the individual with qualities and material goods intended to lessen or remove the possibility of unmeritorious action performed on account of need, envy, etc.; to remove the threat of 'unnatural' death, and, above all, the judgement implicit in it, to assure -

when death is unavoidable - that this implicit judgement and its consequences, rebirth, are favorable; etc. In short, that the dharmaparyāya-Buddha is conceptually the equivalent of our other cult-figures. A point of detail here is of some interest. I have pointed out above that both Bhaiṣajyaguru and Avalokita are said to respond to a whole list of what are sometimes called fears (bhayas) and sometimes called untimely deaths (akālamaraṇa). I also indicated that these lists are just variants of a single more or less standardized list. The point here is that *Sgṭ* presents us with what amounts to a short form of that same list, and that while *Bhg* asserts that Bhaiṣajyaguru will protect the individual from death by poison or 'demons' or the sword, and *SP* XXIV asserts that Avalokita will protect him from the same thing, in *Sgṭ* it is asserted that protection from exactly those things is effected by the dharmaparyāya, the *Saṃghāṭa Sūtra*. Clearly then, from the point of view of the individual, all three are - not only in general terms, but also in points of detail - functionally interchangeable.

e. Hopefully we have now established the context in which Bhaiṣajyaguru would have been seen at Gilgit. But more than that. We have, I think, established a category or, if you will, the type of 'the cult figure' at Gilgit. We have established that behind a great number of 'individual' Buddhas, bodhisattvas, devas, etc., lies a remarkably uniform conceptual model, that all these 'individuals' are constructed on the same basic framework, all are images modelled on a single armature. Their character is *essentially* the same, the range of their activity, the effect of their 'presence', the manner in which they are approached. My analysis has been limited to the Gilgit material. But if our type is a legitimate one - and I think it is - its usefulness for the analysis for other sūtra literature will be obvious. Moreover, whether or not the details of my analysis are accepted, I think it shows the interesting possibilities which the application of 'typing' as a method could produce. It is perhaps unfortunate that the methodological possibilities of a typology - so obviously suited to Mahāyāna studies where one is constantly confronted by a plethora of 'individual' figures - have not been exploited. I know of only one person who has even suggested such a thing (D.Seyfort Ruegg, "Sur les rapports entre le bouddhisme et le 'substrat religieux' indien et tibétain", *Journal Asiatique* (1964) 77-95).

In addition to the establishment of our type, our analysis brings to light at least one other phenomenon closely connected with it, a phenomenon

the methodological importance of which will become increasingly evident. It is, in fact, the process by which the type was generated. In our analysis we can isolate at least two distinct levels of generalization or non-specificity. Taking Bhaiṣajyaguru as our point of reference we may note that 1) Bhaiṣajyaguru's response is situationally non-specific. He responds to a generalized fear or anxiety which can be manifested in any number of specific situations; 2) the response pattern manifested by Bhaiṣajyaguru is not specific to him. It is a generalized pattern exhibited by any number of specific Buddhas (Bhaiṣajyaguru, Amitābha, Śākyamuni, Kāśyapa, Kanakamuni, etc.), bodhisattvas (Avalokita, Vajrapāṇi, etc.), and other figures. This process where individual cases - whether figures or situations - become only examples of a larger category, or where specificity of function is denied by assigning the same function to an ever increasing number of individuals is what I would understand by the expression 'the process of generalization'. This process, which may operate in a number of different directions simultaneously, is a very widespread phenomenon in Mahāyāna literature, and we will have occasion to frequently refer to it in what follows.

[1]

Thus by me was it heard at one time. The Blessed One, wandering around the circuit of the country districts, 1) *arrived at Vaiśālī; in Vaiśālī he stayed awhile.* (1 *At the base of a tree having the sound of music he, accompanied by a great community of bhikṣus, accompanied by eight thousand bhikṣus and thirty-six thousand bodhisattvas, surrounded and honored by kings, ministers, brāhmaṇas and householders,* 2) *by devas and asuras and garuḍas and kinnaras and mahoragas,* (2 *taught Dharma.*

1)(1 X: 'In due time arrived there where the great city of Vaiśālī was. Then the Blessed One there in Vaiśālī stayed awhile.'
2)(2 X: 'and by a great assembly of devas and nāgas and yakṣas and gandharvas and asuras and garuḍas and kinnaras and mahoragas and humans and non-humans,'

---

a. Three texts at Gilgit offer some interesting data bearing on the formula evaṃ mayā śrutam ekasmin samaye. Both *SP* 3.2 and *SmD* 1316.1 open: evaṃ mayā śrutam ekasamaye, and *Eka* 2417.1, though partially damaged, probably also had the same reading (Dutt, GMs i 35.1, evaṃ mayā śru[tam eka] samaye). These three examples seem to indicate that the usual formula may not have been as standardized as we are in the habit of thinking.

We have now, thanks to Ét. Lamotte, *Le traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*, T.I (Louvain: 1949) 56-114, a detailed picture of the ideas which at least one part of the Buddhist community associated with this formula. We also have the interesting study by J.Brough, "'Thus have I heard...'", *BSOAS* 13 (1950) 416-26 (see also A.& H.Wayman, *The Lion's Roar of Queen Śrīmālā* (New York: 1974) 59 n.1; the Waymans refer to an article by N.H.Samtani, "The Opening of the Buddhist Sūtras", *Bhāratī* (Bulletin of the College of Indology) No.8, pt.II (1964-65) 47-63, which I have not been able to see.) Brough treats the phrase from three points of view. On two of these - "(1) the punctuation of the phrase", and

"(3) the significance of the phrase as a whole" - we might add a few observations. With regard to the first, since Brough used only late Nepalese Mss., it might have been expected that the earlier Gilgit Mss. might be able to add something of value to his discussion of the punctuation of the phrase. This expectation, unfortunately, turns out to be false. When the Gilgit punctuation is not entirely erratic (e.g. in *Bhg* X the first punctuation mark comes after janapadacaryān and before caramaṇo), it is virtually the same as that found in the Nepalese Mss.: "... they write *evaṃ mayā śrutam ekasmin samaye* and the first punctuation mark normally comes after *viharati sma*" (so *Bhg* Y; *Sgṭ* (no.37) 2108.1; *SP* 3.2; *Adb* (no.18) 1691.2-3, etc.). In reference to Brough's third point of view I can only point out one aspect of the situation which he seems to have overlooked, an aspect, however, which confirms the essence of what he was saying. Brough (p.424) says: "Now in the Jaina canon there occurs frequently a very similar introductory phrase: *suyaṃ me āusaṃ teṇaṃ bhagavayā evaṃ akkhāyaṃ,* 'It was heard by me, venerable Sir, thus taught by the Blessed One' ... The Jaina phrase, however, is more explicit. Here the first redactor of the scriptures places at the head of his recitation, in order to seal its authenticity, the solemn declaration that he, in person, has heard it taught by the master. It seems to me that there is little doubt that the original sense of the Buddhist phrase is identical." The correctness of Brough's final sentence is perhaps confirmed if we take into account the fact that if evam mayā, etc., is the 'standard' introductory formula to a Buddhist sūtra, then the phrase idam avocat bhagavān is just as surely the 'standard' concluding formula. (It in fact is almost always present even when evam mayā, etc. is not; cf. the individual Avadānas in the Divyāvadāna.) Perhaps we can go even further and say that these two phrases are not in fact two separate formulae, that evam mayā, etc. is only the first part, and idam avocat bhagavān the concluding part of a single basic formula. The correspondence between evam mayā śrutam ... idam avocat bhagavān and the Jaina phrase is virtually complete, This, in turn, to some degree renders the problem of the ekasmin samaye to the status of a non-question at least in terms of the "significance" of the phrase: it is no longer necessary to include ekasmin samaye with evaṃ mayā śrutam to show that the speaker of evaṃ mayā, etc., was reporting what he had heard in person. This is not to say that ekasmin samaye as a piece of syntax is not still a problem.

An interesting case bearing on a number of these points, and one which, I think, establishes the general purport of the formula, is found in the *Dasuttara-Suttanta*. This is one of the few suttas contained in the Pāli canon which the tradition admits was not delivered by the Buddha. It opens, following PTS edition (D iii 272): evam me sutaṃ. ekaṃ samayaṃ bhagavā campāyaṃ viharati ...; but concludes: idam avoca āyasmā sāriputto. This makes it clear that what the speaker heard, and was reporting, was not that 'at one time the Blessed One dwelt at Campā, etc.', but what Sārīputta said when he and the Buddha were there. In this case - and by extension all other cases - ekaṃ samayaṃ could be attached to either what precedes or what follows it without affecting the meaning. The "uncomfortable position" of the adverbial phrase noted by Brough (and Burnouf before him), and the parallel Jaina phrase might, however, argue for attaching it to the following bhagavān, etc. The important thing to be noted is that what the speaker of the formula heard was the speech of the Buddha (and his interlocutors). Everything else - passages describing the setting, action (atha khalu mañjuśrīr ... ekāṃsaṃ cīvaram prāvṛtya, etc.), etc. - are all narrative elements added by the reporter and are not thus, strictly speaking, buddhavacana (cf. Brough, p.425).

[2]

Now then Mañjuśrī, the son of the king of Dharma, through the power of the Buddha having risen from his seat, having put his robe over one shoulder, having put his right knee on the ground, having inclined his folded hands towards the Blessed One, said this to the Blessed One: 1)*"May the Blessed One declare, for the sake of the benefit of those beings in the last time, in the last period, when a counterfeit of the Good Law is current, the names of the Tathāgatas and the extent and excellence of their former vows, having heard which beings would effect the removal of all the obstruction of past acts."*(1

1)(1The construction of the request of Mañjuśrī in both Skt and Tib. is clumsy. This may be due to the fact that the paścime kāle formula is here a later insertion, as I have suggested in the notes to the edition.

---

a. In *Bhg*, as well as in other texts from Gilgit, the epithet dharmarāja has at least two distinct applications. Here it is used as an epithet for the Buddha. So also at *SR III* 16, *VIII* 4, X 21, X 7, *XXVIII* 44, XXXV 25, XXXVI 1,56; *SP* 200.15, 218.19, 57.4, 82.13, etc.; *Sgṭ* 2235.3; *Kv* 293.17, 298.8; and *ŚmD* 99.14, it is either applied to the Buddha Śākyamuni, to Buddhas in general, or used as a name for someone personifying the Buddhist ideal. At *Bhg* [17], *Sgṭ* 2100.6, *Kv* 262.11, 263.12, 276.14 (not in N, but in G fol.1597R), 299.3 and 25 it is used as an epithet of Yama. This second usage is that common to non-Buddhist literature (see A.Wayman, "Studies in Yama and Māra", *IIJ* 3 (1959) 44-73; 112-31; which treats both Buddhist and non-Buddhist sources), and indicates Yama's role as Judge of the dead. This role, as we will see, was well known to the authors of *Bhg*, *Sgṭ* and *Kv*. That the Buddha and Yama shared more than just an epithet might be deduced from passages such as *SP* 116.1f, *Kv* 307.2, where it is a Buddha who appears at the moment of death - at least to the devout man - and gives a pronouncement as to the individual's future destiny. It would appear from such passages, which we will discuss more fully below under *Bhg* [11], that although the Buddha

probably never became an actual judge of the dead, he at least in some ways took on some of the functions of Yama or appeared in place of him in certain situations.

* * * *

b. The passage "Now then Mañjuśrī ... through the power of the Buddha having risen from his seat ... said this to the Blessed One: 'May the Blessed One declare, etc!" is perhaps more important than it may appear. The passage asserts that all Mañjuśrī's actions, actions which result, in this case, in the preaching of the *Bhaiṣajyaguru-sūtra* are not undertaken on his own initiative, but are the result of the Buddha's spiritual power. This assertion of *Bhg* [2] is then reinforced elsewhere in *Bhg*: at [16] it is said that the fact that Ānanda believes in the teaching of the sūtra is to be seen as resulting from the power of the Buddha (tathāgatasyaiṣo 'nubhāvo draṣṭavya); and at [21] that it is through the power of the Buddha that the Mahāyakṣasenāpatis hear the name of Bhaiṣajyaguru, i.e. the text of *Bhg*. The presence of these repeated assertions - obviously important to the composer of *Bhg* - is difficult to explain unless it is admitted that they presuppose a situation in which such assertions were thought necessary. Their presence, in fact, implies a clear awareness on the part of their author of a problem which confronted the whole of the developing Mahāyāna: the problem of the authority of the literature on which it was based. It has been maintained that to meet the problem the compilers of the Mahāyāna sūtras, by "les pieux anachronismes", placed their work in the mouth of the Buddha Śākyamuni; that these "pieux anachronismes" were accepted "à la lettre" and that a "quantité de légendes ou de demi-vérités" were invented to explain them. This, at least, is what I understand Lamotte to be saying in his discussion of the ways in which the Mahāyānist dealt with the authority problem (Ét.Lamotte, "Sur la formation du Mahāyāna" *Asiatica. Festschrift Friedrich Weller* (Leipzig: 1954) 381ff). This view is perhaps too simplistic. It fails to distinguish between the composers or authors of the Sūtras and the authors of śāstras and commentaries. It is, I think, to the latter group alone that we owe the "quantité de légendes ou de demi-vérités". They are, as far as I know, never found in the sūtras themselves. It is of course true, as Lamotte has stated, that the composers of the sūtras made use of an anachronism in attributing their words

to the Buddha; but it is equally true that they did not rely on this anachronism alone; that they were, or appear to have been, more aware and concerned with the problem than Lamotte implies; and that they developed a number of ideas which appear to make sense only when they are taken as attempts - however tentative - to offer some solution. There are texts at Gilgit which preserve passages in which some of these ideas are presented. One such passage is found in the Gilgit *Prajñāpāramitā*.

> GBMs iii 40a.2 (= fol.253) = N.Dutt, *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* (London: 1934) 98.6-99.4; Lhasa, Vol.26, 60-3-5f.

atha bhagavān āyuṣmantaṃ subhūtim āmantrayataḥ pratibhāti te subhūte bodhisatvānāṃ ma[hāsa]tvānāṃ prajñāpāramitām ārabhyaḥ dhārmikīṃkathāṃ kartuṃ kathaṃ bodhisatvā mahāsatvāḥ prajñāpāramitā niryāyuḥ.

atha teṣāṃ bo[dhi]satvānāṃ mahāsatvānāṃ teṣāṃ ca mahāśrāvakāṇāṃ teṣāṃ ca devaputrāṇāmm etad abhūt kim punar āyuṣmān subhūtis (tān ātmakena) svakena prajñāpratibhānavalādhānasannāhena bodhisatvānāṃ mahāsatvānāṃ prajñāpāramitām upadekṣyaty atha buddhānubhāvena ·))

athāyuṣmān subhūtir buddhānubhāvena teṣāṃ bodhisatvānāṃ mahāsatvānāṃ teṣāṃ ca mahāśrāvakāṇaṃ teṣāṃ ca devaputrāṇāṃ cetasaiva cetaḥparivitarkam ājñāyāyuṣmantaṃ śāradvatīputram āmaṃtrayata yat kiṃcid āyuṣmaṃc chāradvatīputra bhagavataḥ śrāvakā bhāṣante 'bhilapaṃty udīrayaṃt[e] sarvaḥ sa tathāgatasya puruṣakāraḥ yaś ca tathāgatena dharmo deśitaḥ sarvaḥ saddharmatayā a(ni)ruddha tat tena kulaputrās tatra dharmadeśanāyāṃ śikṣamāṇāś tān dharmatāṃ sākṣatkurvanti · tathāgata ev(ai)ṣa śāradvatīputro 'pāyayogena bodhisatvānāṃ mahāsatvānāṃ prajñāpāramitām upadekṣyaty aviṣayo 'trāyuṣmaṃc chāradvatīputra sarvaśrāvakapratyekabuddhānāṃ bodhisatvānāṃ mahāsatvānāṃ prajñāpāramitām upadeṣṭu[m]

Then the Blessed One addressed the Venerable Subhūti: 'May it please you, O Subhūti, to make a talk on dharma in reference to the Perfection of Wisdom for the bodhisattvas, mahāsattvas, (as to) how bodhisattvas, mahāsattvas, should go forth to the Perfection of Wisdom !

Then to those bodhisattvas, mahāsattvas, and to those great disciples, and to those devaputras this thought occurred: 'Will the

Venerable Subhūti teach that Perfection of Wisdom to the bodhisattvas, mahāsattvas (...*rnams la*), through his own individual equipment with the attainment of the power of verbal felicity and wisdom, or through the power of the Buddha?'

Then the Venerable Subhūti, through the power of the Buddha, having known through his mind the mind of those bodhisattvas, mahāsattvas, and of those great disciples, and those devaputras, addressed the Venerable Śāradvatīputra: 'O Venerable Śāradvatīputra, whatsover the disciples of the Blessed One say, speak, (and) declare, all that is the work of the Tathāgata (T: de thams cad de bźin gśegs pa'i mthu'o); and which dharma was taught by the Tathāgata, all that is not contrary (reading: aviruddha) to the true nature of things. Therefore, sons of good families training in that teaching of dharma directly experience that (very) nature of things. (As a consequence), it is just the Tathāgata, O Śāradvatīputra, who by means of an expedient will be teaching the Perfection of Wisdom to the bodhisattvas, mahāsattvas. O Venerable Śāradvatīputra, it is not within the sphere of any disciple or pratyekabuddha to teach the Perfection of Wisdom to bodhisattvas, mahāsattvas.

That this passage was not, as Conze seems to imply (*The Large Sutra on Perfect Wisdom* (Berkeley: 1975) 89 n.1), simply intended to explain how it was possible for 'disciples' to teach bodhisattvas "who are their spiritual superiors in the Mahayana hierarchy" is perhaps best indicated by the fact that the same argument is elsewhere given to 'explain' the teaching of devas and bodhisattvas. At *AdP* i 31.10, for example, we find:

athāyuṣmataḥ ānandasyaitad abhūt: kiṃ ayaṃ śakro devānām indra ā(tmīyena svakena pratibhānena prajñāpārami)tāṃ upadiśati prajñāpāramitāyāś ca guṇānuśaṃsān utāho buddhānubhāvena ?

atha śakro devānāṃ indra āyuṣmata ānandasya cetasyaiva cetaḥparivitarkam ā(jñāya āyuṣmantaṃ ānandam etad avocat: bu)ddhānubhāva eṣa bhadantānanda veditavyo yo 'haṃ prajñāpāramitām upadiśāmi ...

atha bhagavān āyuṣmantam ā(nandam etad avocat: evam etat ānanda eva)m etat, tathāgatasyaiṣo 'nubhāva tathāgatasyaitad adhiṣṭhānaṃ.

At *SR* XII 9 it is asserted of the bodhisattva in general that:

yathāvadarśi bhoti
    avitathavacano 'nanyathābhāṣī
sarvaṃ ca [tasya (i.e. a bodhisattva) vacanaṃ
    niścarati jinānubhāvena]

But perhaps the most interesting passage in this regard is from the *Daśabhūmikasūtra*, and although the *Daśabhūmika* is not found at Gilgit, it is worth quoting this passage for the light it throws on GBMs iii 40a, etc. When the bodhisattva Vajragarbha is asked to teach the bhūmis of a Buddha, he prefaces his exposition (i.e. the body of the *Daśabhūmika*) with a series of verses, the last four of which read:

J.Rahder, *Daśabhūmikasūtra* (Louvain: 1926) 10.23-11.8:

etādṛśo gocara durdṛśo 'sya
    vaktuṃ na śakyaḥ sa hi svāśayasthaḥ /
kiṃ tu pravakṣyāmi jinānubhāvataḥ
    śṛṇvantu sarve sahitāḥ sagauravāḥ //

jñānapraveśaḥ sa hi tādṛśo 'sya
    vaktuṃ na kalpair api śakyate yat /
samāsatas tac chṛṇuta bravīmy ahaṃ
    dharmārthatattvaṃ nikhilaṃ yathāsthitam //

sagauravāḥ santa(ḥ) sajjā bhavanto
    vakṣyāmy ahaṃ sādhu jinānubhāvataḥ /
udīrayiṣye varadharmaghoṣaṃ
    dṛṣṭāntayuktaṃ sahitaṃ samākṣaraṃ //

suduṣkaraṃ tad vacasāpi vaktuṃ
    yaś cāprameyaḥ sugatānubhāvaḥ /
mayi praviṣṭaḥ sa ca raśmimūrtiḥ
    yasyānubhāvena mamāsti śaktiḥ //

Of such a kind, difficult to see, is the range of that one (i.e. the Buddha); for he who is dependent on his own mode of thinking it cannot be described. But I, through the might of the Jina, will explain it. May all, concentrated and with respect, listen !

For the penetration into knowledge of that one (the Buddha) is of such a kind that even during (many) kalpas it is not possible to describe. May you listen! I declare in brief the true meaning of Dharma, complete and as it is.

O you being respectful, being prepared, I will speak well through the might of the Jina, I will utter the sound of the excellent Dharma accompanied with examples, flowing, having balanced syllables.

It is very difficult to describe that through mere speech, but which is that immeasurable might of the Sugata, having entered into me in the form of a ray of light, through the might of that I am able to do so.

In order to fully appreciate the significance of these passages a number of points must be underlined. First, in the 'redactions' of the Larger *Prajñāpāramitā*'s the passage we have quoted concerning Subhūti has been displaced from its original position. Although even here it stands at the beginning of the actual teaching. The corresponding passage in both the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* and the *Ratnaguṇasaṃcayagāthā* is found at the very beginning of their respective texts, and in both the question of the authority on which Subhūti speaks constitutes the very first topic to be discussed. The same is true of the *Daśabhūmika* and a similar passage, not quoted here, from the *Sukhāvatīvyūha* (Ashikaga ed. 2.14-5.3). The fact that this topic is given first place indicates its importance for the compilers of these texts. This, of course, need not be surprizing since it appears from the above quotations that the argument, rather than being concerned with the authority on which 'disciples' teach Bodhisattvas, is concerned with the authority on which, regardless of the status of the teacher, the teaching for bodhisattvas (i.e. the Mahāyāna) is based. What is perhaps more surprizing is that these passages, by the direction of their argument, strongly imply a tacit admission that the teaching in question, the teaching intended for bodhisattvas (i.e. the Mahāyāna), may not have been the actual (in our sense) work of the historical Buddha, that it was in fact the work of 'disciples', 'kulaputras', or 'Bodhi-

sattvas'. Otherwise the argument of these passages and their placement has no purpose. This is still further emphasized by a second point that should be noted: in the passage cited above (GBMs iii 40a): Subhūti, rather than replying to the specific question framed by those in the assembly - i.e. 'will *he* teach the Perfection of Wisdom through his own knowledge, or through the power of the Buddha' - makes a general statement: '*whatsoever* the '*disciples*' of the Blessed One say - which must include statements as to what he did or did not teach, etc. - that is the work of the Buddha'. Thus a specific situation is made the occasion for the declaration of a general principle of general application.

In sum then, although the question certainly requires fuller study, these passages and others like them seem to indicate at least two things: one, that the authors or compilers of these sūtras were fully aware of the problem of their authority; and two, that the conception of the Buddha's anubhāva represents at least one response to the problem which was developed by these individuals. This is a very different thing from simply trying to pass off "les pieux anachronismes".

The relevance of all this here is that this whole complex of ideas lies behind the simple passage from *Bhg* [2] with which we started. Limiting ourselves to the passages we have quoted above, we seem to be able to detect there at least three stages in what appears to be a process of simplification of expression of our basic idea. The most elaborate discussion is also almost certainly the oldest. This is GBMs iii 40a; the fact that virtually the same passage is found at the head of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā*, and that this passage in turn has a corresponding section in the *Ratnaguṇasaṃcayagāthā*, guarantees the fact that it probably belongs to the earliest strata of the *Prajñāpāramitā* Literature. In this passage we have not only an assertion that the teaching of a 'disciple' is in fact the teaching of the Buddha, we also have an explanation of how this is so. In *AdP* i 33.10, *SR* XII 9 and *Dbh* 10.25, on the other hand, we have only the assertion; the explanation has been completely omitted. A final stage in the process of simplification is to be seen in *Bhg* [2], [16] and [21]: here it seems to me the whole complex of ideas, the fulness of GBMs iii 40a, is invoked by a single word - buddhānubhāvena. Here not only has the explanation dropped out, but even the direct assertion is no longer apparently necessary. Instead it is enough to use 'buddhānubhāva' as a catch-word for the whole complex, and to insert it at different points in the narrative structure of the text to indicate that all important events

concerning the text - its initial production [2], dissemination [21], and acceptance [16] - were (and are) the work of the Buddha. What we see in our quotations, then, is another good example of the process - very common in Mahāyāna sūtra literature - whereby key words and phrases come to stand for entire concepts, so that passages like *Bhg* [2], which appear to be only pieces of straightforward narrative, all presuppose the sometimes complex, but always more detailed discussions found elsewhere.

Although the concept of the buddhānubhāva was in time diffused and in some sense weakened, I think the above passages indicate its primary and probably original usage. But, without any intention of analyzing its many and probably latter applications, I think at least one of these deserves fuller note. Restricting outselves to one text which is particularly rich in examples, it is possible to say that the concept of the buddhānubhāva was used, or came to be used, to account for the miraculous: all sorts of wonderful things were said to happen buddhānubhāvena - *Rkp* 12.7: tāni ca divyāni tūryāṇi te ca yāvad alaṃkārā bhagavata ṛddhyanubhāvena veṇuvane vavarṣuḥ; *Rkp* 78.1: tena khalu punaḥ samayena sā vīthī buddhānubhāvena yojanaśatavistīrṇāvakāśaṃ saṃdṛśyate sma / tatra ca vīthīmadhye sthaviraḥ śāriputra uttarāmukho niṣaṇṇaḥ / mahāmaudgalyāyanaḥ paś[illegible]ho niṣaṇṇaḥ / ... parasparam ardhayojanapramāṇena tasthuḥ teṣāṃ c[illegible]nāṃ mahāśrāvakānāṃ madhye pṛthivīpradeśasya padaṃ prādur abhavat paṃcaśad dhastavistāraṃ jāṃbūnadamayena daṇḍena, etc.; cf. 23.15, 24.11, 57.5, 91.7, etc. In passages of this kind the meaning of anubhāva blends into that of ṛddhi, adhiṣṭhāna, etc.; and in fact anubhāva is frequently found in close conjunction or in compound with one or another of these terms (e.g. *Rkp* 12.7). The interesting thing for us is that it is distinctly possible that at least something of this meaning inhered even in what appears to be the primary usage which we have discussed above.

For these and other applications of the concept elsewhere at Gilgit I can here only give some further references: *SR* IV 19; 123.1; X 46, XII 9, XVII 31,32,35,40,47; 275.15; XXII 7, XXXII 260, XXXV 20,38,56; 644.1; *Aj* 104.11, 105.19, 106.10, 117.10,11, 134.17, 135.5,19; *StA* 50.6, 54.10; *AdP* i 7.22,23; 71.25; *Bbp* 190-1-3, 190-4-8 / 1289.1, 192-2-7, 193-3-4, 193-3-5, 193-3-6, 194-2-2; *Mvk* vss.3, 83; *Sgṭ* 2140.1ff, 2271.7ff; *Rkp* 4.2, 13.1, 18.2, 137.2, 152.7; *Kv* 261.23, 263.22, 283.18; *SP* 16.24, 81.9, 89.10, 236.7, 244.3, 249.12, 280.9.

* * * *

c. The phrase "... in the last time, in the last period, when a counterfeit of the Good Law is current" is yet another example where a key phrase or formula comes to stand for an entire complex of ideas. Unfortunately, in this case we have little exact information on what this complex of ideas meant to the compilors of the Mahāyāna sūtras and, more importantly, in exactly what ways and to what degree it influenced the direction in which the overall doctrine was developed. The early phases of these ideas have been studied by Przyluski, especially in his chapter "Le développement des idées eschatologiques relatives à la loi" in *La Légende de l'empereur Açoka* (Paris: 1923) 161-85; and by Lamotte, *Histoire du bouddhisme indien* (Louvain: 1958) 210-22. Lamotte, both in *Histoire* and later in *L'Enseignement de Vimalakīrti* (Louvain: 1962) 383 n.25, broadened the inquiry to include at least to some degree the Mahāyāna. However we still do not have anything like a complete study of the problem, and in its absence I can here only touch on a few points concerning the appearance of these ideas at Gilgit.

Taking the Gilgit texts as a whole, one thing is immediately obvious: references to ideas concerning 'the last time' do not occur uniformly throughout. In some of our texts such references are completely absent: *Mvk*, *Eka* and *Śmd*. In others, if such references occur at all, they are extremely rare: *AdP*, *Bbp* (only at 194-4-5), *Sgṭ* (only at 2227.5, 2240.6), *Vaj* (only at 76.1, but cf below), and *Kv* (only in the very last section, 307.9f, which appears very much like it had been added as an after-thought, and which refers only to a decline in the quality of the bhikṣus). These eight texts may be taken as constituting a single group. In addition to this group we may note that references to 'the last time' are found three times in *Bhg* [2], [13], and [17], seven times in *Rkp* (156.19, 159.19, 160.7, 198.8,16, and 199.4, 16 - but bear in mind that this text at Gilgit is very fragmentary, several whole chapters being missing), twelve times in *StA* (50.17, 51.4, 63.2, 65.5,16, 74.6, 80.6, 84.6, 87.4,12,15 and 88.11) and eighteen times in *Aj* (110.16-18, 114.1,3-4, 15-17, 132.6,17, 133.13, 134.8,10,11, 135.2,7,15 and 136.1,5,7). In these texts ideas concerning 'the last time' are present and firmly established. In addition to these four texts, there are two other texts in which such ideas are not only firmly established, but so prevalent as to constitute a major thematic element: in *SR* we find as many as sixty such references, II 14,28,29, III 27,28,29,30,31,36,37,39, IV 23, V 26,27, VIII 11, XI 57,58,60,63, XV 4,6,8, XVI 7,8, XVIII 18,25,30,33,35,39,40,55, XXI 8,19, XXIV 37,63,

XXIX 37,115, XXXI 21,25,30, XXXII 138,141,143,147,279,280,471.1, XXXIV 40, 490.12f, 492.14, XXXV 1, 42,47,98, XXXVI 50, and XXXVII 71,75. (In a few cases the reference may be simply to a later time, and not the technical 'last time'; these are sometimes difficult to distinguish.); while in *SP* there are even more, 27.20, 200.22, 206.6, 218.22, 238.20,25,30, 239.3,14, 20,28,30, 247.3,17, 248.28-249.1, 249.10,16,22, 250.10,17,20, 251.3,5, 252.19, 254.18,29, 256.20, 257.1, 108.28, 110.11, 124.23, 125.3,11,28, 126.3,14,23, 128.5,8, 143.24, 149.2, 150.9,18,151.3, 153.16, 154.12,16, 155.10,18, 167.19, 168.14, 174.24, 175.14, 177.8,12 (plus more than a dozen other references which occur in places in the Nepalese redaction, the corresponding text of which has not been preserved in the Gilgit Mss.) These six texts make up a second group.

Perhaps the most interesting thing about the distribution of references to 'the last time' is that, contrary to what one might expect, they do not appear to follow any definite patterns. One might expect, for example, that their occurrence would be heaviest in those texts which are primarily concerned with karma, rebirth, merit and cult (i.e. with what for the moment we might call 'Popular Buddhism', but cf [3], and lightest in those texts primarily concerned with jñāna, prajñā and bodhi (i.e. with what for the moment we will call 'Philosophic Buddhism', cf. [3]). This, however, is not the case. Of the two texts which are most clearly 'philosophic', *AdP* gives almost no part to ideas concerning 'the last time', while in *SR*, as I have said, they constitute a major thematic element. Likewise, of those texts which might be called 'popular' we find several, *Eka*, *ŚmD*, *Kv*, *Bbp* and *Sgṭ* in which such ideas either do not occur or are virtually of no consequence, while in *Bhg*, *StA*, *Aj* and *SP* - all likewise 'popular' texts - they are firmly established and play a prominent role. In the same way, references to 'the last time' do not appear to correspond to even a rough chronological pattern. For example, it is difficult to believe that *Eka* and *ŚmD*, in which there are no references to 'the last time', were written before *SR*, in which there are sixty such references; or that *Bhg*, *StA*, and *Aj*, in which such references are firmly established, are necessarily earlier than *SP*, where such references are far more prominent.

It is also worth noting that even in those texts in which ideas concerning paścimakāla constitute a significant presence, these ideas are not necessarily used in exactly the same way, nor do they necessarily play

exactly the same role in all texts. We might look briefly at some of the ways in which these ideas are used or the significance attached to them, beginning at least with the shorter texts. In the three references in *Bhg*, the idea of 'the last time' is used in basically the same way: in [2] it is for the benefit of those living in 'the last time' that Mañjuśrī asks the Buddha to declare the names and former vows of the Tathāgatas; and again it is for their benefit that he says in [13] that he will cause the name, and by implication the text of *Bhg*, to be heard. In [17] it is yet again for those living in 'the last time' that the main ritual of *Bhg* is described. In *Bhg*, then, it would appear that the teaching it contained was conceived of as primarily intended for 'the last time', the time at which "a counterfeit of the Good Law was current." In *Aj* it is said that those who preserve the name of Śākyamuni (110.16-18), hear the sound of the striking of the gong and make the namo buddhāya (114.15-17), etc. in the last time, will exhaust their former unfavorable karma; that those who teach or preserve this dharmaparyāya in the last time will awaken to full enlightenment (132.6f); that those who reject this dharmaparyāya or cast aspersions on those who preserve or follow it in the last time do incalculable evil (132.17, 133.13); finally, that the mahāśrāvaka Kāśyapa (134.14), Brahma-sahāmpati (135.18) and the Four Great Kings (136.1f) will protect this text in the last time, that Ānanda will protect those who, in the last time, preserve it (134.8-10), that in the last time Pūrṇa-Maitrāyaṇīputra will teach it for the benefit of all living things (135.11), and that those who copy this sūtra in the last time will not go to an unfortunate destiny, but will go quickly to heaven (svarga, 135.7). Clearly *Aj* contains a number of provisions specifically intended for those living in the last time. That the teaching as a whole was intended for the last time is, however, much less directly expressed than in *Bhg*, and the claim less comprehensive. The last time here is characterized as taking place after the parinirvāṇa of the Buddha (110.17, 114.1, etc.), a time at which there will be destruction of the teaching (śāsanavipralopa, 110.18, 114.4), the destruction and disappearance of the Good Law (saddharmavipralope vartamāne saddharmasyāntardhānakālasamaye, 114.16), and finally, as a very terrible (subhaira) time (134.8,11). At the beginning of *StA* we find a situation very similar to *Bhg* [2]. Here Mañjuśrī says to Avalokiteśvara: santi kulaputra sattvā paścime kāle paścime samaye bhaviṣyanti pāpakāriṇo daridrāḥ kṛśā durvarṇaśarīrā jarāvyādhiparipīḍitāḥ parīttabhogā aparibhāvitakāyā alpāyuṣkā

alpabuddhayo rāgadveṣamohaparipīḍitāḥ / teṣām arthāya kulaputra tathāgatam adhyeṣaya dharmadeśanāyai, etc. (50.17); Avalokita consents to Mañjuśrī's request and addresses the Buddha, saying santi bhagavan sattvāḥ paścime kāle bhaviṣyanti, etc. ... teṣām ahaṃ bhagavan arthāya hitāya ... tathāgatam adhyeṣyāmi (51.4f). Here, as at *Bhg* [2], it is explicitly stated that this teaching is requested for the sake of those living at the last time. This idea is reinforced twice in the text where it is said that in the last time this text (= ayaṃ) will perform the duties or fulfil the function of the Tathāgata (ayam te [= Ānanda] tathāgatasyānuttarasamyaksaṃbodhatathāgatakṛtyaṃ kariṣyati paścime kāle paścime samaye sarvasattvānām, 87.3; 87.11), as well as at 88.10, at the conclusion of *StA*, where the audience says to the Buddha tad yathā sādhu sādhu bhagavan subhāṣitam idaṃ mahādharmaparyāyaṃ sarvasattvānām arthāya tathāgataśāsanacirasthityartham. Apart from these passages, there is another group of passages in *StA* which are of interest. At 63.1 the Buddha begins a series of verses on the merit of preserving the text and honoring those that do with the words: śṛṇuta kulaputra apramattā / mā paścakāle paritāpya (so Ms.) bheṣyata /; and later in the same series we find: idaṃ ca sūtraṃ sadā (so Ms.) dhāritavyaṃ / satkāru nityaṃ ca kartavya dhārake / gandhaiś ca mālyaiś ca vilepanaiś ca / satkāru kṛtvā ca likhāpayeta ... (Dutt has changed the order of the verses) ... mā paścakāle jaravyādhipīḍitā / aneka-āyāsasahasravyākulāḥ / narakeṣu tiryakṣu paribhramāṇa / etc. (65.1f). Bearing in mind that in neither Mss. of *StA* are these verses well preserved, and that the exact significance of the mā construction remains ambiguous (cf. *BHSG* ch.42), these passages might be tentatively translated: 'Listen, son of good family, without distraction, lest in the last time you come to be tormented!', and 'and always this sūtra is to be preserved / constantly honor is to be paid to its preserver / having honored it with perfumes and garlands and unguents, it should be written / lest in the last time (you) are afflicted with old age and sickness / troubled with many thousands of troubles, wandering in the hells and animal births, etc.' These and similar passages (65.16, 84.6), if I understand them correctly, appear to be suggesting something slightly different from what we have met so far. They seem to suggest that not only was the teaching in question intended for those in the last time, but also that by attending to it now one could avoid the troubles of that period. Compare, in this regard, *SR* XIV 23: tasmāc chruṇitvā imu ānuśaṃsā / janetha chandam atulāya bodhaye / mā paścakāle paritāpu bheṣyata / sudurlabhaṃ sugatavarāṇa darśanam /.

These three texts, *Bhg*, *Aj* and *StA*, give us a good idea of the roles the conception of 'the last time' could play in Gilgit sūtra literature. The major forms in which it appears are virtually all seen here, as well as the major elements of its characterization. References to the idea elsewhere - *SR*, *SP*, etc. - add detail and interesting elaborations, but probably, with very few exceptions, no significant major new usages or characterization. One exception, however, deserves to be noted. At *SP* 27.20 - although I quote from Kern's ed. 43.4, since the Gilgit text is fragmentary here - we find: ... yadā tathāgatā arhantaḥ samyaksaṃbuddhā kalpakaṣāye votpadyante sattvakaṣāye vā kleśakaṣāye vā dṛṣṭikaṣāye votpadyante / evaṃrūpeṣu śāriputra kalpasaṃkṣobhakaṣāyeṣu bahusattveṣu alpakuśalamūleṣu tadā śāriputra tathāgatā arhantaḥ samyaksaṃbuddhā upāyakauśalyena tad evaikaṃ buddhayānaṃ triyānanirdeśena nirdiśanti. This is the only place that I know of where it is *explicitly* stated that in time of decline the Buddha makes conscious modifications to the doctrine. This, I think, is important to keep in mind when one is tempted to read this into any number of other passages.

In reference to *Bhg* [2]'s 'counterfeit of the Good Law' (Saddharmapratirūpaka) it should be noted that this idea is comparatively rare at Gilgit. What it meant in *Bhg*, though, would have been clear to a reader of *SP* where it is referred to several times, such as at *SP* 206.31: tasya khalu punaḥ śāradvatīputra padmaprabhasya tathāgatasya parinirvṛtasya dvātṛṃśad antarakalpāḥ saddharma sthāsyati / dvātṛṃśad evāntarakalpāḥ saddharmaprati[rūpa]ka sthāsyati; or *SP* 207.31: parinirvṛtasyāpi jinasya tasya / dvātṛṃśati antarakalpa pūrṇāḥ / saddharmu saṃsthāsyati tasmi kāle / hitāya lokasya sadevakasya / saddharmi kṣīṇe pratirūpako 'sya / dvātṛṃśatī antarakalpa sthāsyati / śarīra vaistārika tasya tāyinaḥ / susatkṛtā naramarutaiś ca nityaṃ (cf. 67.9, 69.16, 70.33, 72.7, 73.9, 146.14, 21; and Lamotte, *Histoire*, 210-17).

The final observation I want to make concerning 'the last time' relates to the suggestion I made above to the effect that the phrase paścime samaye, etc. at *Bhg* [2] looks very much like a case where a well known cliché has been mechanically inserted into the text. At least one text at Gilgit gives unmistakable evidence that such a thing could, and did, happen. The text in question is *Vaj*, and it is worth looking at in some detail for a number of reasons: the occurrences of the formula concerning 'the last time' in *Vaj* are often cited as examples of the way in which this idea is referred to (both Przyluski and Lamotte cite it);

the standard edition of *Vaj* - that of E.Conze - is very unsatisfactory in its treatment of this formula; and, finally, when the later additions are rejected, we have a version of *Vaj* which is remarkably different in tone, if not in content, from that found in our modern editions. We must take the following material into account: C = E.Conze, *Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā* (Rome: 1957); G - the Gilgit text; T - the Tibetan text; and P = F.E.Pargiter, "Vajracchedikā in the Original Sanskrit", in A.F.R. Hoernle, *Manuscript Remains of Buddhist Literature Found in Eastern Turkestan* (Oxford: 1916) 176-95. It should be noted that when Pargiter made his edition of the fragmentary Central Asian Ms he had access only to Müller's published edition, and since the readings of this version very often did not agree with his Ms, he had difficulty in filling some of the gaps in his text. With the publication of the Gilgit text, a text much closer to the Ms which Pargiter used, it has become possible to fill more confidently at least some of the lacunae left by him.

The paścime kāle formula occurs at four places in *Vaj*. The first, C 6, must here be left out of account since this passage in both G and P has not been preserved. At C 14b we read: ye 'pi te bhagavan sattvā bhaviṣyanti anāgate 'dhvani paścime kāle paścime samaye paścimāyāṃ pañcaśatyāṃ saddharmavipralope vartamāne ya imaṃ bhagavan dharmaparyāyaṃ udgrahīṣyanti ... te paramāścaryeṇa samanvāgatā bhaviṣyanti; G 15.1, which Conze notes, has ye te bhagavan satvā imaṃ dharmaparyāyam udgrahīṣyanti ... te paramāścaryasamanvāgatā bhaviṣyanti. What Conze did not note is that P had ye pi xxxxxxxx[paścimāyā; n.12] paṃcāśatyām imaṃ dharmaparyāyam avakalpayiṣyanti, etc. [we could probably fill the gap at the beginning with te bhagavan sattvā]; and that T had only slad ma'i tshe slad ma'i dus lṅa brgya'i tha ma la. At 16b C has the full formula from paścime to vartamāne; here he notes that G has only varime kāle paścimāyāṃ paṃcāśatyāṃ varttamānāyaṃ and P carimikāyāṃ paścimikāyā vartamānāyām; but he does not note that T agrees with G: phyi ma'i dus lṅa brgya'i tha mar gyur pa na. At 21b C reads asti bhagavan kecit sattvā bhaviṣyanty anāgate 'dhvani paścime kāle paścime samaye paścimāyāṃ pañcaśatyāṃ saddharmavipralope vartamāne ya imān evaṃrūpān dharmāñ śrutvābhiśraddadhāsyanti. He notes that G has only asti bhagavan kecit satvā bhaviṣyanty anāgate dhvani ya imān evaṃrūpān dharmān bhāṣamānāṃ cchrutvābhiśraddadhāsyanti; what he did not note is that P probably had virtually the same reading as G: santi bhagavaṃ keci saṃtvā xxxxxx [rd: anāgate 'dhvani] ye ime evaṃrūpadharmān, etc.; and so did T: ma 'oṅs pa'i dus na. In all three cases where we have

more or less complete evidence it is clear that the full formula found in Conze's edition is a later addition. In two cases in G (and Chakravarti maintains that it is the earliest extant version) not only is the full formula not found, but no reference of any kind to a 'last time' is found. At least two points emerge from all this. First, Conze's handling of these passages in his edition is puzzling. At the end of his 17c he omits a passage of several lines because he says it is not found in Kumārajīva's translation or in P or T -- it is also not found in G, though Conze has overlooked this. By his own loose criteria then, should we not also omit paścime kāle paścime samaye paścimāyām pañcaśatyāṃ saddharmavipralope vartamāne at 21b, since it is omitted not only by G, P and T, but also by Kumārajīva and the old Khotanese translation (although I have not cited the last two above, they in almost every case support the readings of the early Mss and not C)? And should we not also apply the same criteria to 14b and 16b ? The second thing which emerges from the above is that in the case of *Vaj* passages concerning the 'last time' were added to the text not only after the time of the Gilgit text, but even after the beginning of the 9th century, the time at which the Tibetan translation was made. That this was irrefutably the case in *Vaj* must caution us to the fact that the same may be true for any number of other texts.

[3]

Then the Blessed One gave approbation to Mañjuśrī, the true heir-apparent: "It is well done, well done. Mañjuśrī is a compassionate one. You, Mañjuśrī, having generated immeasurable compassion, make this request of me for the benefit of beings obstructed by the various obstructions of past actions, for the advantage and ease of devas and men. Therefore, Mañjuśrī, listen well and fix well your attention ! I will speak".

"Even so, O Blessed One", Mañjuśrī, the true heir-apparent, assented to the Blessed One.

On Mañjuśrī see B.Bhattacharya, "Mañjughoṣa", *Jha Commemoration Volume* (Poona: 1937) 59-69; Ét.Lamotte, "Mañjuśrī", *T'oung Pao* 48 (1960) 1-96 (on Kumārabhūta, see pp.13-14). In light of Lamotte's statement that "Le Bodhisattva de la dixième terre porte les titres d'*ekajātipratibaddha* et de *kumārabhūta*", it is interesting to note that the latter epithet is given to Subhūti at *Rkp* 137.1.

* * * *

1. Both here and at *Bhg* [2] our text mentions 'the obstructions of past actions (karmāvaraṇa)', and this brings up the whole complex problem of karma in Mahāyāna literature. For our purposes it is necessary - and possible - to treat only a very few aspects of the question which are directly related to our text (the best overall treatment is probably still L.de La Vallée Poussin, "Dogmatique bouddhique. La négation de l'âme et la doctrine de l'acte", *JA* (1902) 237-306; "Dogmatique bouddhique II, Nouvelles recherches sur la doctrine de l'acte", *JA* (1903) 357-450. But once again, there has been nothing like a thorough study of the concept and its ramifications as they are expressed in Mahāyāna sūtra literature.)

We may begin with a general, but important observation: all the texts at Gilgit, regardless of their general character or 'philosophical' position, accept as a given the karmically constructed world. There is

nowhere an attempt to deny or reject the implications of such a world. This is especially true - contrary to what one is sometimes given to understand - of those texts concerned with pūjā. It is perhaps worth while to cite a number of examples of the way in which this given is expressed.

SR may be taken as representative of those texts which are generally called 'philosophical'.

SR XX 3: nāsti [sa]ttva manuja ca labhya[te
kālu kṛ]tva paraloki gacchi yo
na ca karmakṛtu vipraṇaśyate
kṛṣṇa śukla phalu deti tādṛśam //

There is no 'being', and no 'man' is apprehended who, after having died, would go to another world, but an act which is done is not destroyed: [whether] black or white, it gives a corresponding fruit.

This is not an isolated passage in *SR*; very similar passages may be found at XVII 59, 74, 140; XXI 7; XXIV 41; XXIX 15; XXXVII 35; etc. Another interesting passage from a text of the same character is *Vaj* 7a.4:

ye te subhūte kulaputrā vā kuladuhitaro vā imān evaṃrūpān sūtrāntān udgrahīṣyanti yāvat paryavāpsyanti te paribhūtā bhaviṣyanti suparibhūtāḥ yāni ca teṣāṃ pūrvajanmikāny aśubhāni karmāṇy apāyasaṃvartanīyāni dṛṣṭa eva dharme paribhūtatayā kṣapayiṣyanti buddha-bodhiṃ cānuprāpsyanti.

Subhūti, those sons and daughters of good family who will take up such sūtras, up to: will master (them); they will be despised, much despised; and their unlovely acts which are connected with former births (and) conducive to an unfortunate rebirth will just here and now, through the fact of their being despised, be exhausted, and they will obtain the awakening of a Buddha.

As examples of non-'philosophical' texts we can cite *Eka* 35.10-36.5:

nā[ham] bhagavan samanupaśyāmi sadevake loke samārake sabrahmake saśramaṇabrāhmaṇikāyāḥ prajāyā yad anena hṛdayena rakṣe kṛte paritre parigra[he śā]ntisvastyayane daṇḍaparihare śastraparihare viṣa[prahā]ṇe kṛte yaḥ kaścid atikrame[t] na praśame[t], nedaṃ [sthā]naṃ vidyate sthāpya paurāṇāṃ karma vipacyate.

O Blessed One, I do not observe anything in the world of men, of śramaṇas and brāhmaṇas, together with its devas, māras or brahmas, which, when through this hṛdaya protection, guarding, assistance, peace and well-being is effected, (and) when the laying down of clubs, of swords, the relinquishing of poisons is effected, (if) it would attack, would not be allayed. This situation can not occur apart from the maturing of past action. [It is interesting to note that the same kind of sthāpayitvā pūrvakarmavipākam proviso is found in the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* (Mitra ed.) 56.19, but is missing in the corresponding passage in the Gilgit *Prajñāpāramitā*.]

And *Sgt* 2238.2f; Tib 198-4-1.

evaṃ eva bhaiṣajyasena prathamacittotpādiko bodhisattvo na kadācid vināśadharmā bhavati (sman gyi sde / de bźin du byaṅ chub sems dpa' sems daṅ po bskyed pa'i dge ba'i rtsa ba chud za ba'i chos can du nam yaṅ mi gyur te /) · saṃkṣiptena sarvadharmān prajānāti · āha · kathaṃ bhagavan prathamacittotpādiko bodhisatvaḥ svapnam paśyati · bhagavān āha · bahūni bhaiṣajyasena prathamacittotpādiko bodhisatvaḥ s[v]apnāntare bhayāni paśyati · tatkasya hetor yadā svapnāntare bhayāni paśyati · tadā sarva pāpakāni karmāṇi pariśodhayati (de ci'i phyir źe na / las thams cad yoṅs su sbyoṅ ba'i phyir ro /)· na śakyaṃ bhaiṣajyasena pāpakarmaṇā satvena (sems can sdig pa'i las can gyis ni) tīvraṃ duḥkham apanayituṃ.

Just so, Bhaiṣajyasena, the roots of merit of a bodhisattva who has produced the first thought (towards awakening) never have the character of decay (so Tib.). In short, he knows all dharmas. (Bhaiṣajyasena) said: 'What does the bodhisattva who has produced the first thought see in a dream ?' The Blessed

> One said: 'Bhaiṣajyasena, the bodhisattva who has produced the first thought sees many terrifying things in (his) dream. What is the reason for that ? When he sees terrifying things in a dream, then he effects the purification of all (his) bad actions. It is not possible, Bhaiṣajyasena, for a being having bad actions to avoid acute suffering.'

The final passages we might consider here state the given nature of the karmically constructed world less directly, but no less emphatically. As we have seen already the power of the vow of the Buddhas in *Bbp*, of Avalokita in *Kv* and of Bhaiṣajyaguru in a substantial number of cases, is effective only after the initial death of the individual concerned; that is to say, after, or in the process of his undergoing the consequences of his past action. Two examples will suffice.

> *Bhg* [8] Again further, Mañjuśrī, it happens that beings who in the name of the Tathāgata preserve (outwardly) the rule of training are gone wrong in morality, in behavior, in views. Again, those who are possessed of morality guard morality, (but) they do not seek great learning, etc., etc. ... For such beings again and again there will be a destiny in the hells. By which of those, (however), the name of the Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabha, the Tathāgata, will have been heard [understand: 'when formerly they were men'; So T sṅon mir gyur pa na, and *Bhg* [9], etc.], to them now dwelling in a hell the name of that Tathāgata, through the power of the Buddha, will (again) come to be present. They, having passed away from that place, will once again be born in the world of men. Possessed of correct views ... they, having renounced the household life, etc.

> *Bbp* 193-3-4f: chos kyi rnam grańs 'di yań bris pa dań / 'drir bcug pa dań / bcańs pa dań / klags pa dań / mchod pa de'i phyir sṅon gyi de bźin gśegs pa de dag gi smon lam gyi mthus sems can [dmyal ba] mnar med par 'gro ba dań / ńan soń gsum du skyes pa de dag gi rna bar mtshan rnams thos par 'gyur ro / chos kyi rnam grańs 'di'i mthus kyań sdig pa thams cad bsrabs par 'gyur ro / de bźin gśegs pa de dag gi gzi brjid kyi mthu dań / chos kyi rnam grańs 'di'i mthus dge ba dań mi

> dge ba'i las rjes su dran par gyur nas phyis sdig pa'i las byed par mi 'gyur te / de nas sdug bsṅal de dag las yoṅs su grol bar 'gyur źiṅ bde 'gror 'gro bar 'gyur ro / bla na med pa yaṅ dag par rdzogs pa'i byaṅ chub mṅon par rdzogs par saṅs ma rgyas kyi bar du spyod pa 'thun par 'gyur ro /
>
> On account of copying and having copied and preserving and reading and worshipping this discourse on dharma, through the power of the vows of those former Tathāgatas, (their) names would be heard in the ears of those gone to the Avīci hell and those born in the three unfortunate destinies. Through the power of this discourse on dharma, moreover, all evil would be checked. Through the power of the majesty of those Tathāgatas, and through the power of this discourse on dharma, having recalled to mind (their) good and bad acts [i.e. the fruits thereof], consequently they would not perform evil acts. From that they would be freed from those sufferings and would go to a fortunate destiny. Until they fully and completely awaken to utmost, right and perfect awakening, they would conform to this practice.

In none of these passages do we find an attempt to avoid the implications of a world governed by karma. We have instead a number of attempts to come to terms with them. This is underlined especially in *Bbp* and *Bhg* by the fact that the ritual acts which are intended to bring into effect the power of the Tathāgata's former vows are not undertaken by the individual concerned, but are undertaken by another for the sake of that individual who is already undergoing the consequences of his previous actions (i.e. has already been reborn in an unfortunate destiny), and that such acts, therefore, do not 'save' the individual from the necessity of undergoing - in at least some form - the fruits of his actions. As a matter of fact, it appears that such ritual activity is undertaken not to avoid the consequences of past action, but precisely because their unavoidability is accepted as given.

Implied in this last statement is the view that the acceptance of the karmically constructed world as a given lies at the root of the whole 'system' developed in such texts as *Bhg*. This view is perhaps confirmed by another set of passages we might look at. As we have seen at *Bhg* [2]

Mañjuśrī asks the Buddha for a teaching, "having heard which beings would effect the removal of all the obstruction of past acts (sarvakarmāvaraṇa)". Here in [3] the Blessed One congratulates Mañjuśrī for making his request "for the benefit of beings obstructed by the various obstructions of past actions", and then says 'listen, I will speak'. The implication here is that what follows, i.e. the text of *Bhg*, is intended primarily, perhaps solely, for the removal of 'the obstruction of past acts'. We find virtually the same thing in *Sgṭ*. Here after the standard nidāna, the Bodhisattva Sarvaśūra rises from his seat and says to the Blessed One that many devas, apsaras, bodhisattvas and śrāvakas have assembled to hear dharma and that:

Sgṭ 2112.5, Lhasa 178-4-1:

tat sādhu bhagavan teṣām yathāsannipatitānāṃ tathāgato 'rhat samyaksaṃbuddhas tathārūpaṃ dharmanayapraveśaṃ deśayatu yathaiṣāṃ syād dīrgharātram arthāya hitāya sukhāya devānāṃ ca manuṣyāṇāṃ ca, yathārūpeṇa dharmanayapraveś*ena deśitena ajñānā*·*sa*tvānāṃ (sems can rgan rnams) saha śravaṇenaiva sarvakarmāvaraṇ(āni te)ṣāṃ par(i)kṣayaṃ gaccheyuḥ; daharāś ca satvāḥ kuśaleṣu dharmeṣv abhiyujyamānā viśeṣam adhigaccheyur na ca hīyeran na parihīyeran kuśalair dharmaiḥ [*Sgṭ* 2112.5; Tib. 178-4-1. It might be noted incidentally that this passage will be an important one in working out the relative chronology of the scripts used at Gilgit. The present Ms. is written entirely in Sander's Gilgit/Bamiyan Typ I except for those syllables underlined above which are written, probably over an erasure, in Gilgit/Bamiyan Typ II and are obviously a later 'addition' or 'correction'.]

It would be good, O Blessed One, for the Tathāgata, Arhat, Samyaksaṃbuddha, to declare for these as they are assembled such an entrance into a method of dharma as would be for a long time to their benefit, advantage and ease, and to that of devas and men; through such an entrance into a method of dharma being declared, immediately through its being heard by old (so Tib.) beings all their obstructions from past actions would come to be exhausted, and young beings applying themselves to good dharmas would realize excellence, and they would not diminish or decline in good dharmas.

Immediately following Sarvaśūra's request the Buddha, in the usual fashion, says 'listen well, I shall speak', and the text of *Sgṭ* follows. Here again the implication is that the text is intended primarily to remove the karmāvaraṇa or to ensure, through the application to 'good dharma', that they do not arise. A final example of the same kind of thing is:

> *StA* 51.4; GBMs vii 1747.5; Pek vol. 27, 271-4-3: [Avalokita says to the Buddha:]
>
> santi bhagavan sattvāḥ paścime kāle bhaviṣyanti jarāvyādhiśokamṛtyukāntara [so Ms.] akālamṛtyuparipīḍitāḥ (kṛśā) [ñam chuṅ ba] durvarṇā alpāyuṣkā parīttabhogā aparibhāvitakāyāḥ te [so Ms.] parasparāṇi mātsaryadauḥśīlyacittayā [so Ms.] ghātayiṣyanti, parasparāṇi dhanabhogaiśvaryāṇy apahṛṣyanti [so Ms.], hāsyalāsyanāṭyakrīḍābhiratāḥ anitye nityasaṃjñinaḥ aśubhe śubhasaṃjñinaḥ. te taddheto tannidānā satvā nānāprakārair viheṭhya [Tib: sems can rnams la mi dge ba rnam pa sna tshogs de dag gis gtses nas] narakatiryagyoniyamalokeṣu copapatsyante, tat teṣām ahaṃ bhagavan arthāya hitāya sarvāśāparipūraṇārthaṃ yāvat tathāgatajñānāharaṇārthaṃ buddhakṣetropapattaye sarvapāpanivāraṇārthaṃ tathāgatam adhyeṣyāmi.
>
> There are beings who in the last time will be tormented by old age, disease, sorrow, death, calamities, and untimely deaths; feeble, of bad coloring, shortlived, having meager possessions, undeveloped bodies, they with thoughts of envy and meanness will kill one another, will steal one another's wealth and possessions and power; devoted to laughing and dancing, plays and frivolity, conceiving the permanent in the impermanent, the lovely in the unlovely. From that cause, from that reason, those beings, having done harm in sundry ways, will be reborn in the hells, among animals, or in the world of Yama. It is for their benefit and advantage, for the sake of fulfilling all their hopes, up to: for the sake of conveying the knowledge of the Tathāgata, for their rebirth in a buddhafield, for the sake of suppressing all evil, that I ask the Tathāgata [for this teaching].

Avalokita's request is unmistakably clear concerning the audience for whom the teaching is intended and the goals toward which they are directed. Another passage from the same text makes it equally clear that the 'beings' in question here are precisely those who are karmāvaraṇāvṛta, while at the same time it provides us with an unusually rich picture of what was understood by the term karmāvaraṇa.

> *ŚtA* 54.8; GBMs vii 1754.5 (= A); 1819 L.6 (= B); Pek. vol. 27, 272-3-4: yo tasya [so B] pūrvakarmavipākena syād rūpavaikalyaṃ bhogavaikalyaṃ buddhivaikalyaṃ paribhāṣy[aṃ] vā priyaviprayogaṃ vā rājyakṣobhaṃ vā te asya samādher anubhāvena śravaṇena kecic chīrṣarogeṇa kecid bhaktacchedena kecit kucailābhidhāraṇena kecit kāyacittapīḍena kecit duḥkhasaṃsparśa[śa]yyākalpena kecit paribhāṣyeṇa sarvaṃ tat ka[rmā]varaṇaṃ kṣayaṃ yāsyaṃti [B: kṣapayiṣyati] .... ye ca tasya kulaputrasya kuladuhitur vā cchedabhogaphala- [but B omits bhoga; Tib: loṅs spyod kyi bras bu med par 'gyur pa'i] -saṃvartanīyaṃ karmāvaraṇaṃ bhaviṣyati buddhe vā dharme vā saṃghe vā śrāvakapratyekabuddhe vā mātāpitṛbhir vā karma kṛtaṃ [Tib: sdig pa'i las byas śiṅ] upacitaṃ bhaviṣyati tat sarvaṃ parikṣayaṃ yāsyati, mahaiśvaryasamṛddho bhaviṣyati; ye ca tasya kulaputrasya vā kuladuhitur vā duḥkhanārakavedanīyaṃ karmāvaraṇaṃ bhaviṣyati priyaviprayogasaṃvartanīyaṃ jātyandhasaṃvartanīyaṃ strīsaṃvartanīyaṃ dvivyaṃjanasaṃvartanīyaṃ īrṣyāmānakrodhavaśena yamalokapretatiryagyonisaṃvartanīyaṃ tat sarvaṃ parikṣayaṃ yāsyati.

Which of them would, through the maturation of their past action, be defective in form, defective in possessions, defective in intelligence, or abused or separated from that which is dear, or troubled by the authorities, they, through the power of this Samādhi, through hearing it - some with sickness of the head, some with starvation, some with poor clothing, some with afflictions of body and mind, some with difficulty in sleeping, some with verbal abuse - all that (being the) obstruction of past actions will come to be exhausted. ... And what of that son or daughter of good family will be the obstruction of past action conducive to the fruit of the interruption of enjoyment, (what) will be the accumulated actions done

> toward the Buddha, Dharma or Saṅgha, or toward Śrāvakas and Pratyekabuddhas, or toward one's mother and father, all that will come to be exhausted; there will be a wealth of great power. And what of that son or daughter of good family will be the obstruction of past action which is to be experienced in the hells as suffering, which is conducive to separation from that which is dear, conducive to being born blind, conducive to (rebirth as) a woman, conducive to (rebirth as) a hermaphrodite, which, on account of envy, pride and anger, is conducive to (rebirth in) the world of Yama, among pretas or animals, all that will come to be exhausted.

We can see here that the authors of the texts in which these and similar passages are found explicitly state that these texts are intended to come to terms with the problem of 'the obstruction of past actions'; that is to say that they are texts with a specific purpose, concerned with a specific complex of Buddhist ideas. Such statements of purpose may, I think, provide us with a key to a system of classification which is badly needed for both Mahāyāna canonical literature and Mahāyāna thought, a system of classification which is based, if you will, on the dative of purpose. We have had so far the dichotomies 'popular (= lay)/ monastic' or 'popular/philosophic'; but the first, as we will see below, is totally inadequate for a text like *Bhg* which is intended as much for monks as for laymen; while the second is based on categories, or at least uses a vocabulary, which is without any basis in the texts themselves; and especially the second term in the dichotomy is almost certainly of a tone foreign to the literature or thought it is supposed to be describing. We can, however, avoid the inadequacies and distortions of these categories simply by recognizing that the texts themselves, in their own way and in their own vocabulary, develop an explicit set of classificatory categories which by their very nature are both more legitimate and more useful. A careful reading of our texts will bring to light any number of passages similar to those quoted above where the authors of the individual texts, by means of the dative or adverb of purpose, the ablative of reason, etc., clearly indicate both the audience for whom the text is intended and the problem with which it is concerned or the purpose for which it is taught. Such a reading will, I think, produce two basic classificatory categories. One is exemplified by the passages we have just been looking at. Here a

specific text or teaching is presented by its author as intended to come to terms with the problem of 'the obstructions of past action'; it is intended for the benefit of not only laymen, but also śrāvakas and bodhisattvas, some, if not all, of whom are bhikṣus; it is concerned with karma, merit and demerit, and rebirth. A second category, and one which I will develop below more fully in regard to *SR*, is exemplified by passages where a text or teaching is presented as intended to come to terms with the problem of the obstructions of knowledge (jñānāvaraṇa, although this specific term is more rarely used than karmāvaraṇa); it is intended for both layman and monk, usually simply kulaputra; it is concerned with jñāna, prajñā or bodhi, and with karma only in so far as it effects the acquisition of jñāna, etc. It should be emphasized that these categories refer both to kinds of texts and kinds of Buddhisms, and that these are analytical, not historical categories.

Although neologisms are almost always ugly, here I think they are more than a little useful. With this in mind I would - adapting a similar classification developed and effectively used by Spiro, *Buddhism and Society, A Great Tradition and Its Burmese Vicissitudes* (New York: 1970) - call the first, Karmatic Buddhism, and the second, Bodhic Buddhism. The utility of these analytical categories can, I think, immediately be demonstrated. It is obvious from the discussion under [0] that those texts which develop the conception of the typified cult figure brought to light there are precisely those texts which are to be classified as concerned with Karmatic Buddhism. It will be equally obvious from [14] below that it is that same group of texts which develops the ritual complex which structures the individual's behavior toward such figures. As a matter of fact, it would appear that we have here three components of something like a self-contained 'system': an ideology (the karmically constructed world); the behavior based on that ideology (cult practice and pūjā); and the object of that behavior (the cult figure). Other components of this 'system' will emerge as we go along, but already I think we can say that Karmatic Buddhism is characterized by a preoccupation with karma, merit, and rebirth; that is to say, with the problem of death, since these terms are the major components in a Buddhist conception of death; that it is almost invariably associated with cult and cult practice, and with a specific conception of the Buddha/Bodhisattva figure; and that it is an active concern of both laymen and monks.

Although it is perhaps unnecessary, still it should be noted that by the very nature of our text we have been, and will continue to be, primarily concerned with Karmatic Buddhism or, on the question of pūjā, the reaction to it of Bodhic Buddhism. It might also be added that to a greater or lesser degree these two Buddhisms interpenetrate one another, although in a given text one or the other is invariably dominant. If I am not mistaken, I think that we will find that it is easier to find Karmatic Buddhism in something like a pure form; Bodhic texts, at least at Gilgit (*SR*, *AdP*, *Vaj*), are almost always, at least to some degree, mixed. Future research will undoubtedly modify our classification in the form of intermediate or sub-categories.

[4]

The Blessed One said this to him: "There is, Mañjuśrī, in the eastern direction from this buddhafield, having passed beyond buddhafields equal in number to the sands of ten Ganges Rivers, a world-sphere named Vaiḍūryanirbhāsā. There a Tathāgata, Arhat, Samyaksambuddha named Bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabha dwells, accomplished in wisdom and conduct, a Sugata, a knower of the world, an unexcelled guide of tamable men, the Teacher of devas and men, a Buddha, a Blessed One. Mañjuśrī, of that Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabha, the Tathāgata, when formerly practising the practice of a bodhisattva, there were twelve great vows. What are the twelve ?"

---

a. This entire paragraph is made up of clichés. The description of the position of the world-sphere in reference to this world is standard; the string of epithets applied to the Buddha is standard. Its only significance is that it introduces in *Bhg* the concept of the 'vow' (praṇidhāna). I have already referred several times to the vow and its place in the scheme of things developed in texts like *Bhg*, but a few additional points might be added here.

The conception of a vow is expressed in our texts by at least two terms which appear to be virtually interchangeable: praṇidhāna and pratijñā. This is seen for example in the fact that in *SP* XXIV it is said that for kalpas Avalokita 'refined his vow (praṇidhāna)', while at *Kv* 268. 13, 16 he is said to be one 'having a firm vow (dṛḍhapratijñā); at *Aj* 105.18 Śākyamuni is referred to as dṛḍhapratijño, but at *Aj* 109.19 it is said of him: kṛtaṃ hi nātha praṇidhiṃ tvayā hi; etc., etc. I think we might detect a tendency, but only a tendency, for praṇidhāna to be used in reference to Buddha, and pratijñā with bodhisattvas.

When the vow itself is given it almost always takes the form of a more or less standardized formula: '*when* I am awakened (= yadā, gen. absolute, etc.) ... *then* (tadā, etc.) may (optative) such and such be'

(*Bhg* [5.1], [5.3], etc., *Aj* 132.8; *Rkp* 49.3; 50.4; *SP* 234.18 (= Kern 242.6), etc.). The really important thing to be noted here, however, is that once the vow is vocalized, and once its conditions (or the yadā clause) are fulfilled, then the thing vowed (the contents of the tadā clause) appears to have taken on the qualities of a kind of 'natural' law. It is 'eternally' effective. This is clearly stated at *Bbp* 191-5-5, where it is said that through the power of their vows (pūrvapraṇidhānena) Tathāgatas, *even if* they have been parinirvāṇed (functionally dead) for a thousand years or a kalpa or a koṭī of kalpas, and *even* though situated in various (other) world-spheres, still they - that is to say, their vow - free beings from the hells, etc. The *Stūpasaṃdarśana-parivarta* is a remarkable dramatization of the same basic idea. Here in what is perhaps the central episode in the "mystery play" (so Kern) of *SP*, as Śākyamuni teaches the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, a magnificent stūpa appears in the air from which a voice issues giving approbation to Śākyamuni's teaching. When asked for an explanation of this the Buddha says that the Tathāgata Prabhūtaratna formerly made a vow to the effect that yadā khalv anyeṣu buddhakṣetreṣu buddhā bhagavanta imaṃ saddharmapuṇḍarīkaṃ dharmaparyāyaṃ bhāṣeyuḥ tadāyaṃ mamātmabhāvavigrahastūpo 'sya saddharmapuṇḍarīkasya dharmaparyāyasya śravaṇāya gacchet tathāgatānām antikam (*SP* 234.18; (Kern) 242.6). And it is a result of this vow that the stūpa now appears. The important point here is that Prabhūtaratna has been parinirvāṇed, has been 'dead', for many hundreds of thousands of nayutas of koṭīs of kalpas (*SP* 235.24). Here again, when a Buddha formally articulates a vow, and when the conditional elements of that vow are fulfilled, then the thing vowed comes to be a kind of 'natural' law: given the conditions, the result follows whether or not the Buddha is present or absent, whether or not he is living or dead; and the pattern of 'conditions/cause' produces 'result/effect' is invariable and 'eternally' operable. Seen from one angle, such a conception appears to be only a special application of the basic principle underlying the karmically constructed world: 'if this is done, then that follows'. That basic principle here, however, works on two distinct levels. On one level, if a Buddha makes a formal declaration, and if the conditions of the declaration are fulfilled, then as a result of the Buddha's declaration, the specified result will follow. On a second level, if an individual, basing himself on the declaration of the Buddha, performs an act which fulfils the conditions, then as a consequence of his action the specified result will follow for him. Seen from a

slightly different angle, the conception being developed here is like nothing in the Indian world so much as the satyakriyā, satyavacana or satyādhiṣṭhāna: "The Act of Truth". This particular notion has been much studied by W.Norman Brown, most recently in "Duty as Truth in Ancient India", *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 116 (1972) 252-268 (where he gives a good bibliography on the topic; he has, however, among other things, overlooked the short but interesting discussion in J.Przyluski, *Le concile de Rājagṛha* (Paris: 1926-28) 260-67) and again, recently, by A.Wayman, "The Hindu-Buddhist Rite of Truth; An Interpretation", *Studies in Indian Linguistics* [*Professor M.B.Emeneau Ṣaṣtipūrti Volume*] (Poona: 1968) 365-69. [For instances of 'the Act of Truth' at Gilgit see *SR* 464.3f; *SP* 164.28f; *AdP* i 5.12f, 6.22f, 7.11f, etc. For the same in Mahāyāna sūtra literature outside of Gilgit see *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* (Mitra ed.) 382.14f, 383.17f; Ét.Lamotte, *La concentration de la marche héroïque (Śūraṃgamasamādhisūtra)* (Bruxelles: 1965) 266; A. & H.Wayman, *The Lion's Roar of Queen Śrīmālā* (New York: 1974) 66-67; etc.] For our purposes it is sufficient to note, in Wayman's words, that the Act of Truth "has a traditional form: the performer announces, if such-and-such be true, then let this or that happen" ("Two Traditions of India - Truth and Silence", *Philosophy East and West* 24 (1974) 393). Here, if an individual makes a declaration of truth, and if the conditions making for the truth of that declaration are fulfilled, then the avowed intention of the declaration will be fulfilled. We have then virtually the same basic structure here as we saw in the kind of praṇidhāna discussed above. These two conceptions appear at the very least to be of the same generic type. That the two are closely related is in some ways indicated by the texts themselves. At *StA* 67.5, for example, in the invocatory prayer to Avalokita he is first asked to smara yat tvayā pūrvaṃ satyādhiṣṭhānaṃ kṛtaṃ: 'Remember that formerly an 'Act of Truth' was made by you!', but a few lines later he is asked to smara pratijñā: 'Remember (your) 'vow'', and the two terms obviously refer to the same thing. At *StA* 76.7 Bhīmā is asked to smara pratijñām and then almost immediately invoked as satyavacanadevī and satyavacanapratiṣṭhite. At *SR* XIII 14 a bodhisattva by means of a vow (praṇidhi) extinguishes a raging fire; while at *AdP* i 5.5f a bodhisattva performs a very similar feat by means of an 'Act of truth' (satyavacanena); etc.

What I am suggesting here is that the satyavacana may serve as a useful model for the interpretation of some kinds of praṇidhāna. In the

same way as there are a number of kinds of satyavacana, so there are a number of kinds of praṇidhāna. My remarks above are concerned almost entirely with the kind of praṇidhāna found in *Bhg* and in texts such as the *Sukhāvatīvyūha*. It should also be noted that there is at least one significant difference between the satyavacana and the praṇidhāna: the 'result' of the former is situationally grounded and therefore either of unique occurrence or of limited duration; the latter, as I have already pointed out, is 'eternally' effective. (Cf I. Yamada, *Karuṇāpuṇḍarīka*, Vol.I (London: 1968) 160f. Yamada's suggestions are interesting, but he gives no real evidence to support them.)

The details on all of this remain to be worked out.

[5.1]

His first great vow was: "When I in a future time would fully and completely awaken to the awakening of a Buddha, then may immeasurable, incalculable, unlimited world-spheres, through the splendor of my body, glitter, glow and be radiant. [May all beings be fully ornamented with the thirty-two marks of the Great Man and with the eighty minor marks; as I am, just so may all beings also come to be like that][1]*"*

[1] Translated on the basis of the Tibetan.

This vow is most conveniently treated together with the following. Here we might only note in reference to the final sentence a few things about 'the thirty-two marks'. First of all the reference to all beings possessing the marks is a little unusual. At Gilgit I know of only one text similar to *Bhg* [5.1]; this is a description of the future buddha-field of Pūrṇamaitrāyaṇīputra which reads in part: tena khalu punar bhikṣavaḥ samayena idaṃ buddhakṣetram apagatapāpaṃ bhaviṣyati apagata-mātṛgrāmaṃ ca / sarve ca te sattvā aupapādukā bhaviṣyanti brahmacāriṇo manomayair ātmabhāvaiḥ svayaṃprabhā ṛddhimanto vaihāyasaṃgamā vīryavantaḥ smṛtimantaḥ prajñāvantaḥ suvarṇavarṇaiḥ samucchrayair dvātriṃśadbhir mahāpuruṣalakṣaṇaiḥ samalaṃkṛtavigrahā. (*SP* (Kern ed.) 202.4). In addition to this, the reader at Gilgit would have 'known' that these characteristic marks and their interpretation were associated with the Brahmanical tradition: tasya khalu punaḥ kulaputra rājño vimalacandrasya gṛhe putro jātaḥ; atha sa rājā vimalacandro lakṣaṇanaimittikāṃ cchāstra-paṭhakād brāhmaṇād sannipātya kumāraṃ upadarśyaivam āha · kiṃ brāhmaṇa kumārasya nimittaṃ paśyatha śobhanaṃ aśobhanaṃ veti · (*Sgṭ* 2178.3); and (in reference to the newly born Maitreya): dṛṣṭvaiva (so Ms.) putraṃ subrahmā dvātriṃśadvaralakṣaṇam / pratyavekṣyātha (so Ms.) mantreṣu tadā prīto bhaviṣyati // 42 // gatidvayaṃ kumārasya yathā mantreṣu dṛśyate / ... (*Mvk* vs. 42-3; folio 1536.8). He would also have been familiar with at least one detailed enumeration of both the thirty-two major and the eighty minor marks found at *AdP* ii 49.21ff. Conze has

already noted that in *AdP* ii the thirty-two marks are treated "in a way totally different" from that of the Nepalese *Pañcaviṃsatisāhasrikā*. Finally, and above all else, he would have been familiar with the 'marks' as elements in the stock descriptions of the qualities of Buddhas and certain bodhisattvas: *SR* 34.2, XI 28, XVIII 11, 334.4, XXVII 2,5, XXIX 102, XXXI 23, XXXII 148, 158, 246, 271, XXXIII 27, XXXIV 46, XXXV 11,23,81,etc.; *Aj* 113.12-13, 128,6,7, 134.15,16; *AdP* i 3.23; *Vaj* 5a.2,3, 9b.2,3, 10b.4,5, 6, 11a. 1,2; *SP* 203.13, 204.13, 241.21, 245.6, 246.3 etc. (cf. S.Konow, *The Two First Chapters of the Daśasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* (Oslo: 1941) 48-81; A.Wayman, "Contributions Regarding the Thirty-Two Characteristics of the Great Person", *Sino-Indian Studies* [Liebenthal Festschrift] 5 (1957) 243-60; E.Conze, "The Buddha's Lakṣaṇas in the Prajñāpāramitā", *Journal of the Oriental Institute* (Baroda) 14 (1965) 225-29).

[5.2]

[1][*His second great vow was: "When I in a future time fully and completely awaken to utmost, right and complete awakening, then after I have obtained awakening, as is the precious vaiḍūrya gem, so may (my) body be fully purifed both inside and out, may it be well adorned with purity and light, with great prominent limbs, with splendor and radiating luminosity, with distinction and with nets of rays of light surpassing the sun and moon. Which are the beings born then in the intermediate zones of the world, and which are those in the world of men moving about in various directions in the pitch dark night, may they through my splendor move about at will in all directions, may they also accomplish their activities."*]

1) Translated from the Tibetan

---

a. As I have said above, the first and second vow are best treated together. What they have in common is a concern with the physical description of the Buddha's body and a preoccupation with its radiance and the effect of that radiance. This is of interest because the radiance of a Buddha's body illuminating countless world-spheres came to be a common narrative theme in Buddhist Sanskrit literature. It is especially common in the more elaborate nidānas and as a narrative device used to signal particularly important events. Some aspects of this 'theme' have been studied by Soper ("Aspects of Light Symbolism in Gandhāran Sculpture I, II, & III, *Artibus Asiae* 12 (1949) 252-83; 314-30; 13 (1950) 63-85), although I think he has gone too far in 'detecting' foreign influences. Here I can give only a few characteristic examples from Gilgit.

SP 78.10f, for example, has a number of points in common with *Bhg* [5.2]:

"Then again, O bhikṣus, at the time, on the occasion when the Blessed One Mahābhijñājñānābhibhū, the Tathāgata, etc.... fully and completely awakened to utmost, right and perfect awakening, in each of the ten directions fifty hundreds of

thousands of niyutas of koṭīs of world-spheres were shaken in six ways, and were suffused with great splendor (mahatā cāvabhāsena sphuṭāny abhūvan). And in all those world-spheres the intermediate spaces between worlds, the unfavorable places, enveloped, dark and murky (cf *BHSD* 3), in which neither the sun nor the moon, though having great might and power and strength, are capable of (producing) light by (their) light, nor color by (their) color, nor radiance by (their) radiance - even there on that occasion there was great splendor. And the beings who were reborn in those intermediate spaces became aware of one another (saying) 'What indeed, there are other beings who have been reborn here ! What indeed, there are other beings who have been reborn here!"

Just how common passages of this kind were is indicated by Edgerton's long entry under lokāntarikā (*BHSD* 464-65). He cites *SP* 163.8, one case from *SR*, three from the *Lalitavistara*, six from the *Mahāvastu*, three from the *Divyāvadāna*, and four from Pāli canonical literature. Of these, at least five were available at Gilgit: *SP* 78.10 (= 163.8), *SR* 24.3, and probably the three passages from the *Divyāvadāna* which occur in the *Māndhātāvadāna* (there were at least two Mss. of the Avadāna at Gilgit, GBMs vii 1432-52; 1374. My friend Hisashi Matsumura is now working on these Mss.) Bhaiṣajyaguru, then, when he was made to frame this vow, is presented as one aspiring towards something of a commonplace.

At *AdP* ii 51.20f we find another passage dealing with the characteristics of any Buddha which has much in common with *Bhg* [5.2]:

imāni tasya bhagavato dvātriṃśan mahāpuruṣalakṣaṇāni tais trisāhasramahāsāhasraṃ lokadhātum ava(bhā)sena spharati prakṛtiprabhayā ākāṅkṣann asaṃkhyeyalokadhātun taṃ tathāgataḥ sattva· anukampayā vyāmaprabhayāṃ adhitiṣṭhati, na khalu punaḥ sūryacandramasoḥ prabhā prajñāyeta na māsārdhamāsa (na saṃva)tsa(ra) vā.

These are the thirty-two marks of a great man of the Blessed One; through them he covers the three-thousand-great-thousand world-sphere with splendor; through his natural radiance he, if he wishes, (illuminates) incalculable world-spheres; the Tathāgata, out of compassion for beings, sustains

> that measure of radiance and the radiance of the sun and the moon (next to it) is not even perceptible, nor is the month or the half month, not a whole year.

Once again, Bhaiṣajyaguru's aspiration is in no sense out of the ordinary.

Other passages concerning the avabhāsa or prabhā of the Buddha's presence are more elaborate, and some of these elaborations are of particular interest in reference to *Bhg*. I quote here as a good example a passage from the nidāna of *StA*. The passage in question has not been preserved in the Gilgit Ms. of *StA*, so I cite its Tibetan translation:

> Pek. Vol.27, 271-1-5 (cf GMs i 49.16f for Dutt's reconstruction of the Skt.):
>
> de nas de'i tshe bcom ldan 'das sems can thams cad de la dmigs pa sñiṅ rje chen po'i śes pa la gnas pa źes bya ba'i tiṅ ṅe 'dzin la sñoms par śugs so / tiṅ ṅe 'dzin de'i mthus stoṅ gsum gyi stoṅ chen po'i 'jig rten gyi khams 'di 'od kyis snaṅ bar gyur ciṅ / gzugs thams cad snaṅ bas khyab par gyur nas / sems can dmus loṅ gaṅ yin pa de dag gis ni mig gis gzugs rnams mthoṅ bar gyur to / 'on pa rnams kyis ni rna bas sgra rnams thos par gyur to / nad kyis btab pa rnams ni nad dag daṅ bral bar gyur to / gos med pa rnams ni gos dag thob par gyur to / smyon pa rnams ni dran pa thob par gyur to / lus ñams pa daṅ dbaṅ po ma tshaṅ ba rnams ni lus daṅ dbaṅ po yoṅs su rdzogs par gyur to / dbul po rnams kyis ni nor dag thob par gyur to / sems can gaṅ dag nor daṅ yo byad daṅ / loṅs spyod med pa de dag nor daṅ / yo byad daṅ loṅs spyod dag daṅ ldan par gyur to / sems can thams cad kyaṅ bde ba thams cad daṅ ldan źiṅ bsam pa thams cad yoṅs su rdzogs par gyur to / ... sems can gaṅ dag klu daṅ / gnod sbyin daṅ / srin po daṅ / yi dags daṅ / śa za rnams kyi naṅ na skyes pa de dag gis kyaṅ saṅs rgyas rjes su dran pa so sor thob nas sems can thams cad la byams pa gnas pa daṅ / lus daṅ sems bde bar gyur nas chos mñan pa'i phyir bcom ldan 'das ga la ba der lhags so / sems can gaṅ dag gśin rje'i 'jig rten rnams su mun pa mun nag gi naṅ du skyes pa de dag kyaṅ saṅs rgyas kyi mthus yud tsam źig dran pa so sor thob nas gcig gis gcig kun tu śes par gyur te / de dag mun pa chen po de nas yoṅs su thar bar gyur to / sems can thams cad gcig la

gcig byams par gnas śiṅ ñe ba'i ñon moṅs pa rnams daṅ bral bar gyur te /

Then at that time the Blessed One entered into the concentration (samādhi) called 'Established in the Knowledge of Great Compassion and the Apprehension of all Beings'. Through the power of this concentration the three-thousand-great-thousand world-sphere became illuminated with radiance, and all forms having been pervaded with light, those beings who were blind saw forms with their eyes; those who were deaf, heard sounds with their ears; those tormented by disease were freed from disease; those without clothes obtained clothes; the crazy regained their senses; those with imperfect bodies and impaired faculties were made whole in body and their faculties complete; the poor obtained riches; those without riches and essentials and possessions came to possess riches and essentials and possessions; all beings achieved complete ease and their hopes were fulfilled .... those beings who were reborn among nāgas and yakṣas and rākṣasas and pretas and piśācas also having obtained the recollection of the Buddha, having established friendliness towards all beings and become comfortable in body and mind, assembled there for the sake of hearing dharma; which beings were reborn in the thick darkness of the worlds of Yama, they also, through the power of the Buddha, having obtained a single moment of recollection, became conscious of one another and they were freed from the great darkness; all beings, establishing themselves in mutual friendliness, were rid of their depravities.

A similar but even more elaborate passage of this kind is found at *GP* 177.4f, where it forms almost the whole of the first chapter (see also the commentary on it, Ét.Lamotte, *Le Traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*, T.I (Louvain: 1949) 485ff). These passages have much in common not only with *Bhg* [5.1] and [5.2], but also with a number of the other vows (e.g. [5.6], [5.7], [5.11], [5.12]), and with the whole tone and much of the content of karmatic Buddhism. They clearly show, especially *GP* 177.4f, the degree to which such ideas have penetrated even the most abstruse Bodhic texts. And they once again underline the almost total lack of uniqueness in the character of Bhaiṣajyaguru: even his most salient

feature, his vows, are made up by and large of the stock-in-trade of Sanskrit canonical literature.

[5.3]

His third great vow was: "And when I have obtained awakening, through (my) attainment of the power of immeasurable wisdom and means, may limitless spheres of beings come to be such as have inexhaustible enjoyment and means of subsistence, and may there not be for any beings an insufficiency in any way."

---

a. Passages of this kind are often, and I think wrongly, taken to reflect a purely materialistic concern. In fact, in the karmically constructed world material and spiritual well-being are inextricably interwoven to the point that any distinction disappears. This is fully illustrated in the story of the young washerwoman (nagarāvalambikā dārikā) of Śrāvastī recounted at *Aj* 107.6ff. Here this inextricable interconnection is developed by a set of explicitly stated causal relationships. She herself twice declares avaśyaṃ me pūrvakṛtena karmaṇā / yenāhaṃ [jāta] daridrake gṛhe /: 'Inevitably, by an act which was done formerly by me I am born in a poor household'. (*Aj* 109.9 and 111.6 and cf. 111.18f). Because of her present state of poverty she weeps, saying mama gṛhe na kadācit piṇḍapātika āgato 'bhut: 'Never did one who lives on alms come to my house' (*Aj* 107.9); i.e. she never had the opportunity to perform merit-producing acts. Then after a Śuddhāvāsakāyika devaputra supplies her with suitable things and she bestows them on the Blessed One saying anena piṇḍapātakuśalamūlena mā kasmiṃściddaridragṛhe upapadyeya: 'By the root of merit from these alms may I never be reborn in a poor household', he says to her ekena tvayā dārike kuśalamūlena bodhivyākaraṇaṃ pratilapsyase ... tvaṃ dārike saptame divase kālaṃ kariṣyasi. kālaṃ kṛtvā ... rājño 'jitasenasya putro janiṣyase. eṣa eva tava paścimo garbhavāso bhaviṣyati: 'By this single root of merit, daughter, you will obtain a prediction of awakening ... You, daughter, will die on the seventh day. Having died you will be born as the son of the Rājā Ajitasena [i.e. will be freed from both poverty and existence as a woman]; this will surely be the last time you will enter a womb.' 'Material' and 'spiritual' are here inreparably interlocked and passages of this kind are legion in Buddhist literature. As a matter of fact, in time, a distinct genre came to be devoted to working out in great detail these interlockings (c.f. S.Lévi,

Mahākarmavibhaṅga (La grande classification des actes) (Paris: 1932); D.N.MacKenzie, *The 'Sūtra of the Causes and Effects of Actions' in Sogdian* (London: 1970); at Gilgit this genre is represented by the *Āyuṣparyanta-sūtra* (No.19), the *Prasenajitgāthā* (Nos. 21 and 59), etc., which I have not studied.)

Yet other aspects of this interconnectedness are recognized in *Bhg* at [5.11] where Bhaiṣajyaguru is made to say: 'whichever beings burnt by the fire of hunger, intent upon getting food, commit an evil act, may I with food possessed of fine color and odor and flavor refresh their body; afterwards, may I establish (them) in endless ease through the flavor of dharma.' Here *Bhg* recognizes, first, that want not only limits the possibility of performing merit producing acts (as in the case of the nagarāvalambikā), but is, or can be, the cause for performing acts which produce demerit; and, second, that there is in the human condition something like a 'hierarchy of needs' - food first, and spiritual food later.

* * * *

Perhaps the best source at Gilgit in reference to the place of the aprameyaprajñopāya of the Buddha in karmatic Buddhism is *Bbp*. By a fortunate accident the most relevant portion corresponds almost exactly to the fragment of the Ms. which has come down to us. I have already translated this fragment elsewhere so I need not cite it here (G.Schopen, ' The Five Leaves of the Buddhabalādhānaprātihāryavikurvāṇanirdeśa-sūtra Found at Gilgit', *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 6 (1978) 1-18.)

[5.4]

His fourth great vow was: "Being one who has obtained awakening, may I establish beings entered on a wrong path on the path to awakening; (those) entered on the path of Disciples, or (those) entered on the path of Pratyekabuddhas, having urged all towards the Mahāyāna, may I establish (them there)."

[5.5]

His fifth great vow was: "When I have obtained awakening, whichever beings undertake religious practice in my teaching[1)]*, and likewise immeasurable, incalculable, limitless other beings*[(1]*, may they all be such as have unbroken morality, restrained by the three (forms of) restraint; may there not be for anyone having gone wrong in morality, after having heard my name*[2]*, the undergoing of an unfortunate destiny."*

1)(1 Redaction B omits this entirely, giving the passage a kind of 'exclusivist' tone totally absent in Redaction A. 2) T alone adds: '(and) through my power (anubhāva).

Compare this vow with [8] and [15] below.

[5.6]

His sixth great vow was: "When I have obtained awakening whichever beings are such as have inferior bodies, imperfect senses, dark coloring, are retarded, palsied, one-eyed, lame, hump-backed, [[1]leprous, maimed, blind, deaf, crazy, and others having diseases which arise in the body, may they all, after having heard my name, come to be such as have complete senses (and) fully formed limbs."

1) From this point to the beginning of [5.9] we have only Ms.X, the translation of which I have enclosed in brackets.

---

a. We have already seen in the note on [5.2] two passages, one from *StA* and one from *GP*, in which the prabhā or avabhāsa of the Tathāgata fulfils virtually the same function which hearing the name of Bhaiṣajyaguru is here intended to fulfil. Even some of the specific conditions to be relieved are exactly the same: blindness, deafness, insanity and general disease. But the reader at Gilgit would have known other passages for some of the other conditions in the list and, therefore, other means to prevent or avoid these conditions. I quote here a few characteristic examples:

> *Kv* 289.17; fol.1614R: ye kāraṇḍavyūhasya mahāyānasūtrarāja-syaikākṣaram api likhāpayiṣyanti ... na ca te hīnendriyā bhavanti; na ca te khañjakubjakordhvanāsagaṇḍalamboṣṭhāś ca [but Ms: na ca punaḥ laṃgakubjakonakhelagaruḍārdhoṣṭhātraś caxxx..] sattvāḥ kuṣṭhinaś ca santaḥ; na ca teṣāṃ kāye vyādhiḥ saṃkramate.
>
> Those who will have copied even a single syllable of the *Kāraṇḍavyūha*, the king of the Mahāyāna sūtras, do not come to be such as have inferior faculties; and they are not lame or hump-backed or one-eyed or palsied, etc.... and not leprous; and diseases do not attack their body.

Another passage from *Kv* condenses these conditions into a single expression, but ascribes their prevention to yet another agency:

Kv 282.32; fol. 1605L: ye cāvalokiteśvarasyaikam api puṣpaṃ niryātayanti te sugandhikāyā bhavanti; yatra yatropapadyante tatra tatra paripūrṇakāyāś ca bhavanti.

And who presents even a single flower to Avalokiteśvara, they come to be such as have a sweet smelling body; wherever they are reborn, there they have a fully formed body.

These examples are typical of karmatic texts. But perhaps what is more interesting is the fact that we find similar passages also in our Bodhic texts. I give here two examples:

AdP i 41.19: Here, of a bodhisattva who trains (śikṣ-) in sameness (samatā), thusness (tathatā), etc., it is said: na kāṇo bhavati. na kubjo bhavati. na laṃgo bhavati. nonāṅgo bhavati. na badhiro bhavati. na paṅkapatito bhavati. na vikalendriyo bhavati. paripūrṇendriyo bhavati, nāparipūrṇendriyaḥ: He does not become one-eyed. He does not become hump-backed, lame, defective in limb, deaf, 'utterly destitute' (so Conze), impaired in his senses; he becomes one having complete senses, not incomplete.

SR XXXI 22:

so 'ndho naiva kadāci bheṣyati vidu jātu
no co aṅgavihīnu bheṣyati bahukalpān
teno akṣaṇa aṣṭa varjitā imi nityaṃ
yeno sūtram idaṃ prabhāṣitaṃ apramuṣṭaṃ

That wise one will certainly never anywhere become blind; and in many kalpas he will not be deprived of a limb. He will always avoid the eight inopportune moments, (he) by whom this sūtra is recited without distraction.

The presence of such passages in texts like *SR*, *AdP*, etc., once more indicates the degree to which these texts have been penetrated by, or are preoccupied with, karmatic concerns. The fact that the removal of the same conditions is ascribed to the avabhāsa of the Buddha in concentration, to hearing the name of Bhaiṣajyaguru, to copying even a single syllable from the *Kāraṇḍavyūha* or giving a single flower to Avalokita,

to training in thusness, etc., is yet another example of what I have called the process of generalization.

Here too, as with the case of poverty (which is often included in the same lists with these physical defects and deformities) the 'physical' and 'spiritual' are irredeemably interlocked. For if the reader at Gilgit knew how to prevent such defects, he also knew exactly how they were incurred. Put simply, in the words of *StA* 54.8, pūrvakarmavipākenāsya rūpavaikalyaṃ: 'his bodily defects arose through the maturation of past acts'. But his texts went beyond this general statement to ascribe one or another of these conditions to more specific causes. *Aj* 133.8, for example, says that he who rejects the Good Law (saddharmapratikṣepaka) will be burdened with twelve deformities (dvādaśahalyāni pravahiṣyanti). A series of more than twenty verses at *SP* 219.18f begins kṣipitva sūtraṃ idam evarūpaṃ / mayi tiṣṭhamāne parinirvṛte vā / bhikṣūṣu vā teṣu khilāni kṛtvā / teṣāṃ vipākaṃ mamiha śṛṇotha: 'having rejected a sūtra such as this, either while I remain or after I have parinirvāṇed; or having acted harshly towards these monks - hear me ! Here is the maturation of those (acts)'. Then follows a long list among which we find: they will be one-eyed (kāṇaka), vf. 119; retarded (jaḍa), vs. 120; lame (laṅgaka), hump-backed (kubja), one-eyed and blind (kāṇāndha) retarded, vs. 122, etc. At *Kv* 307.28 it says ye sāṃghikasyānnapānāder anyāyena paribhogaṃ kurvanti te 'lpaśruteṣu kuleṣu jāyante. hīnendriyāś ca jāyante, khañja-[rd.-laṃga-as before]-kubjakāṇavāmanāś ca jāyante, etc.: "those who improperly make use of food, drink, etc., belonging to the Saṅgha are born into families of little learning; they are born having inferior faculties; they are born lame, hump-backed, one-eyed and dwarfish, etc.'

Again, when any of these passages is taken in isolation it appears to a 'modern' reader confused and naive. But when we take into account the whole literature it is clear that the Gilgit reader would have had a consistent and symmetrical conception of these conditions: he would have known both their causes and the means for their prevention or removal. In regard to these 'means' there is at least one point worth noting. In *Kv*, *AdP*, and *SR*, an individual undertakes a specific action for his own sake, he gives a single flower to Avalokita, etc., and he himself will be reborn with a fully formed body. At *StA* and *GP*, however, an action is performed by one individual (i.e. the Buddha) for the benefit not of himself, but for others. Seen in light of this distinction this vow and the others which are similarly worded, as well as much

else in *Bhg*, takes on a particular significance. Bhaiṣajyaguru here does not vow to prevent or remove these conditions himself; he is not the active agent. His vow is only that if an individual should hear his name, then he should come to be complete in his senses, etc. (in exactly the same way as Prabhūtaratna's vow was if a Buddha preaches the *Saddharma*, then his stūpa should appear at the site of that preaching; see above under [4]). If lameness, etc., are to be avoided, then it is necessary for the name of Bhaiṣajyaguru to be heard by the individual concerned. But for this to take place it must be spoken or recited *by another*. Hence the importance of Mañjuśrī's promise (tathāgatasya nāmadheyaṃ nānopāyaiḥ saṃśrāvayiṣyāmi) at *Bhg* [13], and the importance attached to the ritualized recitation and handling of the text (i.e. the source of Bhaiṣajyaguru's name) by an individual, or individuals, for the sake of another in the primary pūjā described in *Bhg*. These remarks foreshadow a central theme in *Bhg* since, as we will see, it appears to be primarily concerned with action undertaken for another (cf. A.Wayman, "Buddhist Tantric Medicine Theory on Behalf of Oneself and Others", *Kailash* 1 (1973) 153-58). A final observation here is that if the individual at Gilgit desired to assist others who were maimed he could do so in one of two ways: by becoming a Buddha, or by causing them to hear the name of Bhaiṣajyaguru.

[5.7]

His seventh great vow was: "And when I have obtained awakening, which beings are tormented by various diseases, are without recourse, without refuge, are deprived of medicine and the requisites for life, helpless, poor, having suffered - if my name should fall on their ears, may all their diseases fade away, may they be healthy and free of calamities until they end by awakening."

---

a. If the usual interpretation of Bhaiṣajyaguru as a, or the, Buddha of healing were correct, we would expect that ideas concerning disease, medicine, and healing would have a prominent place in *Bhg*. As a matter of fact, if we exclude [17] and [18] which are concerned almost exclusively with death and therefore incurable disease, the only references to disease in the entire text are found in [5.6], in the present vow, and at [20]. What is more, in none of these three sections is disease the sole or central concern; it is only one of a list of things which are of concern to men: [5.6] is, as we have seen, primarily concerned with physical defects or deformities; [20] with the kinds of 'untimely deaths', which, apart from the first, have nothing to do with disease. [5.7] is as close as we get to a passage concerned primarily with disease, but even here it shares the stage with poverty, helplessness, etc. This lack of emphasis on disease and healing in *Bhg* confirms what I have already said in reference to the character of Bhaiṣajyaguru. This, of course, is not to say that disease and healing and ideas surrounding them were not important in the Buddhism of Gilgit: they formed, in fact, a major preoccupation, especially, but not exclusively, of the karmatic Buddhism of Gilgit. For this reason, and because such ideas have played such a prominent part in the previous interpretations of Bhaiṣajyaguru, it will be worth our while to look in some detail at the conceptions of disease and healing current at Gilgit. (For a much broader perspective see P. Demiéville, "Byō: maladie et médecine dans les textes bouddhiques"; Extrait du *Hōbōgirin*, 3e fascicule (Paris: 1937) 224-65. See also J.Nobel, *Ein alter medizinischer Sanskrit-Text*

und seine Deutung, Supplement to the Journal of the American Oriental Society, No. 11, 1951.)

The first point to be noted is that the reader at Gilgit would have 'known' that disease, like poverty and physical deformities, was ultimately caused by his previous actions. Even the practitioner of 'empirical medicine' begins his diagnosis with the reflection that: asya puruṣasya pāpena karmaṇā vyādhir utpannaḥ: 'the disease of this man arose through a (former) evil act' (*SP* 62.11). This ultimate etiology, though not always directly stated, was always implicitly recognized. It is important to take this 'cause' into account because it determines the kind of treatment or means of prevention which are suggested and considered effective. It accounts, in short, for the fact that 'non-empirical medicine' predominated at Gilgit.

The second point to be noted is that the Gilgit reader would have been well aware of the conceptions of 'empirical medicine'. So well aware that they could be used as the first member of a comparison. A good example of both this kind of passage and of what falls into the category 'empirical medicine' is *Bbp* 1290.5f. I quote here my published translation and repeat what I said there: I do not really understand much of the technical vocabulary and I have mechanically translated from the dictionary.

> For instance, just as, indeed O Son of the Jina, a well trained Doctor, having obtained all eight (branches) of the Ayur-veda, being skilled in all [medical] conditions, having engaged in the use of all medicinal substances and (instruments), (of sick people) tormented in body by (various) diseases he knows the condition, knows the strength, knows the limit, knows the [pertinent] herb, [that] related to wind, related to bile, related to phlegm, ([that] coming from the derangement of all three, [that] coming from the blood), indigestion, abdominal glandular enlargement, dropsy, heart disease, leprosy, (cutaneous eruptions, abscesses), boils, etc., poison and spreading eruptions, etc., he knows. He, having known all that, (through various types of medical remedies), through the use of (vomitives, purgatives), compound powders, sternutatory treatments, bleeding, ghee, oil, and undeveloped powders, by the means of application of suppuratives and vomitives, of all

beings all those diseases he causes to be allayed [and] he frees them from the fear of the various diseases. Just so, indeed, O Son of Jinas, the Tathāgata, possessed of the Ayur-veda (of) the manifold samādhis, etc. ...

Other interesting passages showing a detailed knowledge of 'empirical medicine' and 'empirical medical' practices and treatments may be seen at *SP* 62.6ff; 113.31ff; *Sgṭ* 2128.3ff; etc.

If the reader at Gilgit was well aware of 'empirical medicine', its techniques and treatments, he was even more aware that it has clear and unmistakable limitations:

SR IX 43-45: yathā naro ātu[rukāya duḥkhito
bahuhi varṣehi na jātu] mucyate
sa dīrghagailānya duḥkhena pīḍitaḥ
paryeṣate vaidyu cikitsanārthikaḥ // 43 //

punaḥ punas tena gaveṣatā ca
āsādito vai[dya vidu vicakṣaṇaḥ
kāruṇyatām tena upastha]petvā
prayuktu bhaiṣajyam idam niṣevyatām // 44 //

gṛhītva bhaiṣajya prabhum varām varām
na seva[te āturu yena mucyate]
na vaidyadoṣo na ca bhaiṣajānām
tasyaiva doṣo bhavi āturasya // 45 //

As a man, sick in body, suffered; (and) through many years was never freed. He, afflicted with suffering through this protracted illness, sought out a physician for a cure. // 43 //

Again and again he searched; (finally) he encountered a wise, experienced physician, who feeling compassion toward him prescribed a suitable medicine. // 44 //

Having taken much of (this) very excellent medicine, it did not help (that) sick man in such a way that he was cured. But that was not a fault of the physician nor of the medicine. That was a fault of the sick man himself.

At *SP* 221.3, one of the results (vipāka) of rejecting a sūtra such as the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* is that:

yaṃ cāpi te tatra bhajanti auṣadhaṃ
suyuktarūpaṃ kuśalehi dattaṃ
tenāpi teṣāṃ ruju bhūya vardhate
so vyādhir antaṃ na kadāci gacchati

And moreover they then take well prepared medicaments given to them by those skilled (in such matters), but that only further aggravates their sickness: that disease never comes to an end.

Another passage in *SR* is transitional in terms of our discussion: it indicates once again that there were limits to the effectiveness of 'empirical medicine', but it goes beyond this and indicates at least one form of the alternative, Buddhist conception of medicine and effective treatment and prevention.

SR XVI 1-6:

smarāmi pūrvaṃ caramānu cāri[kaṃ
siṃhadhvajasya sugatasya] śāsane
abhūṣi bhikṣu vidu dharmabhāṇako
nāmena so ucyati brahmadattaḥ // 1 //

ahaṃ tadāsīn mati rājaputro
ābādhiko bā[ḍhagilāna duḥkhitaḥ
mahyam ca so ā]cariyo abhūṣi
yo brahmadattas tada dharmabhāṇakaḥ // 2 //

paṃcottarā vaidyaśatā anūnakā
vyādhiṃ cikitsanti udyuktamāna[sāḥ
vyādhiṃ na śaknanti mama cikitsituṃ]
sarve mama jñātaya āsi duḥkhitāḥ // 3 //

śrutvā ca gailānyu sa mahya bhikṣu
gilāna pṛccho mama antikāga[taḥ
kṛpāṃ janetvā mama brahmadatto
imaṃ sa]mādhiṃ varu tatra deśayī // 4 //

tasya mamā etu samadhi śrutvā
utpanna prīti ariyā nirāmiṣā
svabhāvu dharmā[ṇa prajānamāno
ucchvāsi vyādhī tuhu] tasmi kāle // 5 //

dīpaṃkaraḥ so caramāṇu cārikāṃ
abhūṣi bhikṣur vidu dharmabhāṇakaḥ
ahaṃ ca āsīn mati rājaputraḥ
samādhi[jñānena hi vyādhi mocitaḥ // 6 //

I remember formerly pursuing my course in the teaching of the Sugata Siṃhadhvaja. (At that time) there was a wise bhikṣu, a reciter of dharma. He was called by the name Brahmadatta. // 1 //

I at that time was a prince (named) Mati, sick, severely ill, afflicted. He who was Brahmadatta, the reciter of dharma, was at that time my teacher. // 2 //

Not less than five hundred physicians, feverishly intent, treated the disease, (but) they were not able to cure my sickness. All my relatives were saddened. // 3 //

But that bhikṣu, having heard about my illness, came to me asking about the illness. Pity having arisen in him, Brahmadatta then taught me this excellent *Samādhi(-rāja-sūtra)* // 4 //

Having heard this Samādhi(-rāja-sūtra) from him, a noble, spiritual joy arose in me. Understanding the own-being of dharmas, I indeed recovered from that disease then ! // 5 //

It was Dīpaṃkara pursuing his course who was that wise bhikṣu, the reciter of dharma; and I was the prince Mati who was freed from disease through knowledge of this *Samādhi(-rāja-sūtra)*.

We have here presented in obvious contrast to a limited 'empirical medicine', a good example of what is undoubtedly the dominant conception of the effective means of treatment and prevention of illness at Gilgit. In general discussions of kinds of medicine, 'empirical medicine' is

usually contrasted with 'magical medicine'. In the present context, however, the latter designation seems altogether inappropriate. There is nothing 'magical' about the treatment or the cure, given the accepted etiology of all disease: it is caused by past actions. Since the disease is karmatically caused it calls for karmatic treatment. This, as I have already suggested, explains the origins of the limitations of 'empirical medicine'. In light of this I think it is better to call the conception of medicine which is presented here, and accepted everywhere at Gilgit, 'karmatic', not 'magical', medicine. By so naming it we explicitly recognize that it forms an integral part of what we have called karmatic Buddhism. It is, in fact, one of the major preoccupations of this 'system'. That this conception was not limited to this 'system', however, is already clear from the passage just quoted from *SR*, one of the predominantly Bodhic texts found at Gilgit. That this is not an isolated passage will be seen from the quotation of a few additional passages from both *SR* and *AdP*.

SR XXXII 174-176:

śokātha śalyā tathariva cittapīḍā
   no tasya jātu bhaviṣyati paṇḍitasya
ārogyaprāpto bhaviṣyati sarvakālaṃ
   dhāritva śāntaṃ imu virajaṃ samādhim// 174 //

ye kāyaśūlās tathariva cittaśūlāḥ
   ye dantaśūlās tathapi ca śīrṣaśūlāḥ
no tasya bhontī vyādhayu jīvaloke
   dhāritva śāntaṃ imu virajaṃ samādhim // 175 //

yāvanta rogā bahuvidha martaloke
   ye kāyarogās tathariva cittarogāḥ
te tasya rogāḥ satataṃ na jātu bhonti
   dhāritva śāntaṃ imu virajaṃ samādhim // 176 //

Then there will never be suffering, pain, so also mental torments, for that wise one; at all times he will have achieved a state of health, after having preserved this auspicious, pure *Samādhi* // 174 //

Which are the afflictions of the body, so also of the mind; which are the afflictions of the teeth, so also

of the head; he has none of these diseases in the world of men, after having preserved this auspicious, pure *Samādhi*. // 175 //

As many as are the many kinds of illnesses in the world of men, illnesses of body as well as mind, he will continually never have these illnesses, after having preserved this auspicious, pure *Samādhi*. // 176 //

[To 'preserve the Samādhi' may mean any or all of the following: 1) to 'preserve' the text of the *Samādhi-rāja-sūtra*; 2) to 'preserve' the teaching contained in the text; 3) to 'preserve' the particular form of concentration named *samādhirāja*.]

AdP i 31.2: ime bhikṣor dṛṣṭadhārmikā guṇā bhaviṣyanti tasya bodhisattvasya mahāsattvasyeha gambhīrāyāṃ prajñāpāramitāyāṃ carataḥ. tasmin samaye yāni tāni sannipātikāni glānyāni, tadyathā cakṣurogaḥ śrotrarogaḥ jihvārogo dantaśūlaṃ kāyaśūlaṃ cittaśūlaṃ yāvat tāni sarvāṇi kāye notpatsyante na nipatiṣyante. ime bodhisattvasya mahāsattvasya dṛṣṭadhārmikā guṇāḥ pratikāṃkṣitavyā iha gambhīrāyāṃ prajñāpāramitāyāṃ carataḥ

As usual, these passages are representative and many others could be cited. They are sufficient, however, to indicate that even texts such as *SR* and *AdP* were concerned with the problem of sickness and disease and presented means considered effective to cope with it. And this, again, is important for showing to what degree these texts are karmatically oriented. But if such concern is a significant presence in these texts, it can be a massive presence in those texts which we have called karmatic. We might look quickly at a number of these karmatic texts, concentrating on the means each prescribes or makes available to prevent or 'treat' sickness and disease.

Aj:

At 118.17, fol.2375.1, we read yo dāsyate asya hi piṇḍapātaṃ / muktā tu [so Ms.] bheṣyaṃti jarā tu [so Ms.] vyādhayā /: 'who will give alms to him [a bhikṣu], they indeed will be freed from old age and disease.' At 132.14: ya imaṃ dharmaparyāyaṃ sakalaṃ samāptaṃ saṃprakāśayiṣyanti muktās ca bhaviṣyanti jātijarāvyādhiparidevaduḥkhadaurmanasyopāyāsebhyaḥ parimuktā bhaviṣyanti: 'who will illuminate this

discourse on dharma complete and entire, they will be freed, they will be completely freed from birth, old age, disease, sorrow, suffering, depression and perturbation.

Eka:

At 35.8, the introductory section of the text, Avalokita explicitly says that the first reason for which he speaks [i.e., the first reason for which the text is delivered] is sarvavyādhipraśa[ma]nāya: 'for the sake of allaying all disease'. At 37.1 we find: evaṃ bahukaro 'yaṃ hṛdayam, tasmāt tarhi śrāddhena kulaputreṇa vā kuladuhitrā vā satkṛtyāyaṃ hṛdayaṃ sādhayitavyam, ananyamanasā nityaṃ sādhayitavyam; kalyam utthāya aṣṭottaravāraśataṃ pravartayitavyam, dṛṣṭadharmikā guṇā daśa parigrahī[tavyā]. katame daśa. yaduta nirvyādhir bhaviṣyati, etc....: 'This [ekadaśa-]hṛdaya is thus a doer-of-much. Therefore then, by a devout son or daughter of good family this hṛdaya is to be zealously effected; constantly, with no other thought, it is to be effected; at dawn it is to be performed 108 times. [From that] ten qualities are to be received here-and-now. Which ten ? Namely: He will be free of disease, etc.' At 38.13: mama nāmadheyagrahena [sa]rvasattvā ... sarvavyādhibhiḥ [pa]rimucyate: "through retaining my [Avalokita's] name all beings are completely freed from all diseases'.

RkP:

There are at least two passages in *RkP* which are of particular interest here:

RkP 40.11-41.1; GMs iv 41.1-9; GBMs vi 1197.2-5; Pek. Vol.32, 187-5-3.

yatra kvacid grāme vā nagare vā nigame vā manuṣyāṇāṃ vā-amanuṣyāṇāṃ vā catuṣpadānāṃ vādhitānām akālamaraṇaṃ viheṭhā vā syāt tatrāyaṃ ratnaketudhāraṇīpustako mahāpūjopakaraṇaiḥ praveśayitavyaḥ / praveśya susnātena suviliptagātreṇa navacīvaraprāvṛtena brahmacāriṇā nānāpuṣpasamīrite nānāgandhapradhūpite nānārasaparivṛte siṃhāsane 'bhiruhya tatrāyaṃ ratnaketudhāraṇīpustako vācayitavyaḥ / sarve tatra vyādhayo 'kālamaraṇāni ca praśamaṃ yāsyaṃti / sarvāṇi ca tatra bhayaromaharṣadurnimittāny aṃtardhāsyaṃti /

Wherever in a village or city or town there could be [fatal] harm or an untimely death of humans or non-humans or four footed

creatures who are afflicted with disease, there this book of the *Ratnaketudhāraṇī* with the requisites for great pūjā is to be brought forth. Having been brought forth, by one being well bathed, having his limbs well anointed, being dressed in new clothes, being continent, having mounted a lion-throne strewn with various flowers, perfumed with various scents, covered with various pastes, this book of the *Ratnaketudhāraṇī* then is to be read out. There all sicknesses and untimely deaths will be allayed. And there all fears and terrors and ill omens will disappear.

RkP 137.5-138.7; GMs iv 118.7-119.10; GBMs vii 1261.3-1262.4

tena khalu punaḥ samayena gaṃgānadīvālukāsamāḥ kumārabhūtā bodhisatvā mahāsatvā ekakaṇṭhenaivam āhuḥ / vayam apy asyāt dhāraṇyāc chandaṃ dadāmo 'dhiṣṭhāmaḥ / yaḥ kaścit kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā bhikṣur vā bhikṣuṇī vā upāsako vā upāsikā vā snātvā śucīni cīvarāṇi prāvṛtya nānāpuṣpasaṃcchanne nānāgandhapradhūpite nānārasaparivṛte nānāvastrābharaṇaduṣyasaṃsthite cchatradhvajapatākocchrepite svalaṃkṛte maṇḍalamāḍe mṛdusukhasaṃsparśe siṃhāsane 'bhiruhyemān dhāraṇī(ṃ) saṃprakāśaye / na cāsya kaści cittasaṃkṣobhaṃ kāyasaṃkṣobhaṃ manaḥsaṃkṣobhaṃ vā kariṣyati / na cāsya kaścit kāye śvāsaṃ mokṣyati / śīrṣarogaṃ kartu(ṃ) śakṣyati / nedaṃ sthānaṃ vidyate / na kāyarogaṃ vā na jihvārogaṃ na dantarogaṃ nāsthirogaṃ na grīvārogaṃ na bāhurogaṃ na pṛṣṭhirogaṃ nāntrarogaṃ nodararogaṃ na śroṇīrogaṃ norurogaṃ na jaṃghārogaṃ kaścit kartu(ṃ) śakṣyati / na cāsya svarasaṃkṣobho bhaviṣyati / yaś ca tasya dharmabhāṇakasya pūrvāśubhakarmaṇā dhātusaṃkṣobhaḥ svarasaṃkṣobho vā syāt tasyemān dhāraṇīṃ vācayataḥ sarvo niḥśeṣaṃ praśamiṣyati karmaparikṣayāt svastir bhaviṣyati / ye 'pi tatra dharmaśrāvaṇikāḥ sannipatiṣyaṃti teṣām api na kaścid dhātusaṃkṣobhaṃ kariṣyati svarasaṃkṣobhaṃ vā / ye ca tatremān dhāraṇīṃ śroṣyaṃti teṣā(ṃ) yad aśubhena karmaṇā dīrghagailānyaṃ dhātusaṃkṣobho vā svarasaṃkṣobho vā syāt (t)at sarvaṃ parikṣayaṃ yāsyati.

Then again on that occasion heir-apparent bodhisattvas, mahāsattvas, equal in number to the sands of the river Ganges with a single voice spoke thus: 'We also give validation to this dhāraṇī, we empower it. Whatever son or daughter of good family, or bhikṣu or bhikṣuṇī, or lay man or woman having bathed, having put on clean

clothes, in a circular hall strewn with various flowers, perfumed with various scents, covered with various pastes, formed with various clothes and ornaments and fine cotton, well decorated with umbrellas and flags and banners raised aloft, having mounted a lion throne which is soft and comfortable to the touch, would illuminate this dhāraṇī, of him no one can cause a disturbance of thought or disturbance of body or disturbance of mind; nothing can deprive his body of breath; it is not possible to effect a disease of the head. This situation cannot occur. No one is able to cause a disease of the body or of the tongue or teeth or bones or neck or arms or back or intestines or stomach or buttocks or chest or of the shanks. Of him there will be no disturbance of the voice. And what would be the potential disturbance of the condition or voice of that reciter of dharma due to former unmeritorious acts, all that, from the recitation of this dhāraṇī, will be completely allayed, and from the exhaustion of that karma there will be good fortune. Moreover, which hearers of dharma will assemble there, of them also no one will cause a disturbance of their condition or their voice; and who will there hear this dhāraṇī, of them what would be the potential long illness or disturbance of their condition or voice due to unmeritorious action, all that will go to complete exhaustion.

StA:

At 53.5 (fol.1752.3) we find: yadā saddharmaparyāyaṃ paṃca-maṇḍalena praṇipatya puṣpadhūpagandhamālyavilepanacchatradhvajapatākaiḥ samalaṃkṛtya namo buddhāyeti kṛtvā namaskariṣyanti sādhukāraṃ dāsyanti dhārayiṣyanti ... likhāpayiṣyanti paramagauravaṃ cittam utpādya tasya dharmabhāṇakasyāntike te dṛṣṭa eva dharme sarvaguṇa-[so Ms.]-samanvāgatā bhaviṣyanti abhirūpāḥ prāsādikā darśanīyā vigatavyādhayo dīrghāyuṣkāḥ, etc.: 'When, having prostrated themselves through the five-fold prostration before this Saddharmaparyāya, having decorated it with flowers, incense, etc., having made before it the 'namo buddhāya', they will worship it, will make approbation to it, will preserve ... will have it copied after having produced a thought of great respect in the presence of the reciter of dharma, they just here and now will be possessed of all qualities, (they will be) handsome, agreeable, lovely, freed from disease, long lived, etc. At 55.11 the Blessed One describes

a dhāraṇīmantrapada - in fact an 'invocatory prayer' - as sarvākāla-mṛtyuduḥsvapnasarvavyādhipraśamanakara, as 'the allayer of all untimely deaths and bad dreams and all diseases', and then describes its ritualized recitation (cf 56.13). At 57.9 Vajrapāṇi says that he would give an 'invocatory prayer' which even if heard in a dream would protect the individual from śarīre daurbalyaṃ vā kleśo vā vyādhir vā jvaro vā kāyaśūlaṃ vā cittapiḍā vā akālamṛtyu vā, etc. He then describes its ritualized recitation and says he who performs it: vigatavyādhayo cirajīvī sarvapāpavivarjito bhaviṣyati, 59.8. Virtually the same pattern is found at 66.14 and 69.16 of a 'dhāraṇī' given by Avalokita, and at 75.6f of one given by Bhīmā, a Mahādevī (see esp. 77.9; the ritual forms which appear in all these cases will be given later in detail). At 65.1 we find idaṃ ca sūtraṃ sada dhāritavyaṃ / satkāru nityaṃ ca kartavya dhārake / ... mā paścakāle jaravyādhipīḍitā, etc. At 78.15: dānaṃ dattvā te sattvā aparimuktā eva bhavanti jarāvyādhimaraṇaśokaparidevaduḥkhadaurmanasyopāyāsebhyaḥ ... [but] ... asya dharmaparyāyasya śravaṇaṃ sattvebhyaḥ kṛtvā pūjanaṃ saṃprakāśanaṃ [ca] kṛtvā arthaṃ cāsyāvaśrutya pratipattyā pratipadya parimuktā eva bhavanti jātijarāvyādhimaraṇśokaparidevaduḥkhadaurmanasyopāyāsebhyaḥ, etc. cf. 61.14; 80.14; 80.19; 84.3. All of these passages in *StA* follow naturally from the fact that the author of *StA*, like the author of *Eka*, explicitly states (through the mouth of Avalokita) that the teaching (i.e. the text) was requested for the sake of allaying all diseases' (sarvavyādhipraśamanāya, 50.20; 50.18, 51.5).

Bbp:

At 193-5-4 we find: bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa / gaṅ rigs kyi bu 'am rigs kyi bu mo 'am / rgyal po 'am / blon po 'am / dge sloṅ 'am / dge sloṅ ma 'am / dge bsñen nam / dge bsñen ma la źig gis chos kyi rnam graṅs 'di de bźin gśegs pa la dad pas bcaṅs pa daṅ / mchod pa daṅ / 'dri ba daṅ / 'drir 'jug pa daṅ / yaṅ dag par bstan na des yon tan chen po brgyad thob par 'gyur te / brgyad gaṅ źe na / gaṅ dag 'jig rten na nad daṅ gnod pa de dag de la thams cad kyi thams cad du mi 'byuṅ ba daṅ / etc.: 'The Blessed One said: If some son or daughter of good family, or king or minister or monk or nun or lay man or woman, with faith in the Tathāgata, preserves and worships and copies and has copied and teaches this discourse on dharma, they will obtain eight great blessings. Which eight ? Which are the diseases and injuries in the world, they will never anywhere arise in him; etc. See also 194-2-3-4.

Kv

279.6, fol.1601L: ye 'pi kecit kulaputrāḥ sattvā asmāt kāraṇḍavyūhamahāyānasūtraratnarājād ekākṣaram api nāmadheyam api catuṣpādikām api gāthāṃ likhāpayiṣyanti ... teṣāṃ na kaścit kāye vyādhiḥ prabhaviṣyati / na cakṣurogaṃ na śrotrarogaṃ na ghrāṇarogaṃ na jihvārogaṃ na kāyarogaṃ: 'Whatever son of good family will have copied from this king of the jewels of the Mahāyāna sūtras, the *Kāraṇḍavyūha*, even only a single syllable, or the name, or a gāthā of four lines, in his body no disease whatever will appear, no illness of the eye, ear, nose, tongue or body. Cf. 278.31, 289.20, 282.25.

See also *SP* 262.11, 166.30, 167.2, 168.18; *Sgṭ* 2160.4, etc., etc.

A number of observations are, or have been, suggested by these passages and others like them. We might summarize these observations in the following way: 1) Sickness and disease were a major preoccupation in the Buddhism of Gilgit. 2) Although there are references to 'healing' in *Bhg*, they are very few, and, when seen in light of our other texts at Gilgit, they clearly emerge as of no particular significance: they are of such a kind as can be found in almost any other text. 3) Although aware of 'empirical medicine', its techniques, etc., the individual at Gilgit would also have 'known' its limitations and would have approached it as a less than entirely effective means for the treatment and prevention of disease. 4) The primary etiology of disease was karmatic; i.e. connected with the individual's past actions, his accumulation of merit or demerit. 5) The primary means of cure and prevention were completely consistent with this primary etiology; they were above all karmatic. 6) These means fall into a number of recognizable categories: a) There are specific rituals involving the ritualized recitation of a 'dhāraṇī' or some other verbal component (the 'name', etc.), and usually calling into play a prior pratijñā on the part of the person who has 'given' the dhāraṇī, etc. - this is above all the pattern in *StA*, but applies also to *Eka* and the second passage from *Rkp*. b) There are a number of activities to be undertaken in regard to texts: recitation *(Aj, Rkp)*, worship *(StA, Bbp)*, copying or having copied *(Bbp, Kv)*; these activities are also based on prior assurances of their merit producing potential and their ability to effect the desired ends. This second category is the most widely distributed and has an old and established place in the Buddhist

tradition. Most of these activites represent the exact Mahāyāna counterpart to what came to be known in Hīnayāna practice as the '*Paritta*' - they follow the same form and are undertaken for the same reason. This unbroken continuity between the early '*Paritta*' and any number of later Mahāyāna forms has never been fully acknowledged. (On the '*Paritta*' see E.Waldschmidt, "Das Paritta. Eine magische Zeremonie der buddhistischen Priester", *Baessler-Archiv* 17 (1934) 139-50 and recent anthropological works on Buddhism in modern South-East Asia.) c) The last category consists of actions of a somewhat different kind: 'practising in the Perfection of Wisdom' (prajñāpāramitāyāṃ car-), having undertaken vigor (ārabdhavīrya; *SR* XXVIII 9), etc. are all said to prevent disease and sickness. This dovetailing of conventional religious practice of a bodhic kind with karmatic concerns will be seen again several times below.

7) It is clear from all this that there was at Gilgit nothing like a central 'healing' figure - whether it be Bhaiṣajyaguru or anyone else - nor anything like a separately organized 'healing' cult: the 'healing function', if you will, was part and parcel of karmatic Buddhism.

[5.8]

His eighth great vow was: "Whichever woman, spurning existence as a woman afflicted by the many hundred defects of women, wanting to rid herself of womanhood, would preserve my name, for that woman may there be no (further) existence as a woman until she end by awakening."[1]

[1]T: 'His eighth great vow was: 'When I in a future time fully and completely awaken to utmost, right and complete awakening, then after I have obtained awakening, whichever women would be afflicted by the hundred defects of women and, depreciating existence as a woman, would desire to free themselves from womanhood, may they be turned from existence as a woman; until they end by awakening, may the organs of a male be manifested !'

---

a. *Bhg* [12] forms a kind of pair with this vow: 'Again, by which woman the name of that Tathāgata [Bhaiṣajyaguru] will be heard, (will be) taken up, this existence as a woman is to be anticipated as her last'. Passages such as these make it clear that existence as a woman was considered both a negative state and a state to be avoided. This is confirmed by passages which state that existence as a woman is 'an obstruction caused by past action' (karmāvaraṇa) and is therefore both implicitly and explicitly classed with poverty, disease, deformities, rebirths in the hells, etc. So *StA* 55.5, 65.10; *Aj* 108.19, 109.14, 111.9; *Rkp* 42.10, etc. And further confirmed in those passages where women themselves declare their desire to be free of their condition (*Kv* 304.15; *Rkp* 12.12; etc.). Again, the same basic attitude is expressed in a somewhat different way in yet another kind of passage, one example of which is *Bhg* [6]. Here we find among the positively valued characteristics of a buddhafield the fact that it is apagatakāmadoṣa, apagatāpāyaduḥkhaśabda, and apagatamātṛgrāma, 'free of (even) the word 'unfortunate rebirth' or 'suffering', 'free of women'; at *SP* (Kern ed.) 202.4 we find the same value placed on virtually the same characteristics: buddhakṣetram apagatapāpam [but rd. apagatāpāyaṃ with T: ṅan soṅ med par] bhaviṣyaty apagatamātṛgrāmaṃ ca. (So also 160.19; 290.9 (= Kern 455.3); etc.).

A passage in *SP* gives us a fairly clear idea of perhaps the major reason for this overwhelmingly negative attitude

> *SP* 245.13; Kern 264.9: asti kulaputri strī na vīryaṃ sraṃ[saya]-ti anekāni ca kalpasahasrāṇi puṇ[y]āni karoti, ṣaṭpāramitā [pa]ri-pūrayati, na [c]ā[d]yāpi buddhatvaṃ prāp[n]oti. kiṃkāraṇaṃ. pañca sthānāni strī adyāpi na prāpnoti. katamā[n]i [pañca. prathamaṃ brahma-]sthānaṃ. dvitīyaṃ śakrasthānaṃ. tritīyaṃ mahārājasthānam. caturthaṃ cakravartisthānam. pañcamam avaivartikabodhisattvasthānam.
>
> 'O daughter of good family, it may happen that a woman does not let up in effort and for many thousands of kalpas makes merit, fulfils the six perfections, but even now (a woman) does not obtain the state of a Buddha. Why ? There are five states which a woman even now does not obtain. Which five ? The first is the state of Brahma; the second is the state of Śakra; the third is the state of a great king; the fourth is the state of a cakravartin; the fifth is the state of an irreversible bodhisattva.'

This is an old and established idea (cf. *Majjhima* iii 65.24-66.9; *Aṅguttara* i 28.9-19) and what it means, of course, is that existence as a woman excluded one from the higher state theoretically open to mankind, whether wordly or religious. It is in this sense that *a woman is not fully human*, since the primary advantage of human birth is that it gives the individual access to these states. This restriction, coupled with the conventional Buddhist view which saw women above all as an obstacle to a man's religious development - the 'seducer' or 'temptress' - (*SR* XXXII 62-64; 187; 192; *SP* ch.XIII passim; etc.) largely accounts for the negative attitude towards existence as a woman.

But the situation is not quite so simple because, although our texts never abandon this negative attitude, they all clearly attempt to accommodate or include women in their schemes of 'salvation'. We see this already in *Bhg* [5.8] and [12] where the text makes explicit provision for the needs of a woman; that is to say, makes available to her a means through which she can escape from her disadvantageous condition. *Bhg* is in this regard not at all unique and I quote here a few other examples:

> *Bbp* 195-1-7: bud med kyi lus ñon moṅs pa daṅ ñe ba'i ñon moṅs pas ñon moṅs par gyur pa la la žig ñin gcig gam / ñin ma phyed

dam / yud tsam yaṅ ruṅ ste / gsum la skyabs su 'gro ba yaṅ dag par len ciṅ bslab pa 'dzin par byed na de dag thams cad bud med kyi dṅos po daṅ / sdug bsṅal daṅ / yid mi bde ba daṅ / 'khrug pa thams cad rnam par bzlog ste / sdug bsṅal mthar byas nas bla na med pa yaṅ dag par rdzogs pa'i byaṅ chub tu mṅon par rdzogs par saṅs rgyas kyi bar du bde 'gror 'gro bar 'gyur ro /

'Whosoever is afflicted with the afflictions and depravities of existence as a woman, if they for one day or a half a day or even for a moment would take 'the threefold going for refuge (triśaraṇagamana), or maintain the discipline (śikṣā), they all would avoid all existence as a woman, suffering, unhappiness of mind, and contention; having made an end of suffering, until the time that they will fully and completely awaken to utmost, right and complete awakening they will go to a good destiny.

Rkp 37.8: [the Tathāgata Jyotiḥsomyagandhāvabhāsaśrī says:] asti bhagini paryāyo yena mātrigrāmo mātrigrāmabhāvaṃ laghv eva parivartayati pūrvākṣiptamātṛgrāmabhāvo laghv aśeṣaṃ kṣīyate na ca bhūyo mātṛgrāmeṣūpapattiṃ pratigṛhṇāti yāvad anuttaraparinirvāṇād anya[tra] (sva)praṇidhānā[t]. tatra bhagini kataraḥ paryāyo yena paryāyeṇa mātṛgrāmo laghu puruṣo bhavati pūrvākṣiptaṃ ca mātrigrāmabhāvaṃ laghv aśeṣaṃ kṣapayati. iha bhaginīyaṃ ratnaketur nāma dhāraṇī mahārthikā mahānuśaṃsā mahāprabhāvā sarvamātrigrāmabhāvakṣayakarī kāyavākcittaduḥkhavipākadauṣṭhulyaṃ niravaśeṣaṃ kṣapayati. asyāś ca ratnaketudhāraṇyāḥ sahaśravaṇena mātrigrāmasya mātṛgrāmabhāvo niravaśeṣo gacchati. strīndriyaṃ antardhāya puruṣendriyaṃ prādurbhavati. puruṣaś cāpi rūpa(vān sarv)āṃgaparipūrṇo bhavati.

'There is, sister, a means through which a woman can quickly reverse her existence as a woman, (through which) an existence as a woman planted in the past can be quickly exhausted without remainder, (through which) she does not again take rebirth as a woman until her utmost parinirvāṇa, apart from her own vow (to do so). And, sister, what then is the means by which a woman quickly becomes a man and (any) existence as a woman planted in the past is quickly exhausted without remainder ? Here, sister,

this dhāraṇī named *Ratnaketu*, of great benefit, blessing, and power, the exhauster of all existence as a woman, exhausts without remainder the depravity which matures in suffering of body, speech and mind. And immediately through hearing this *Ratnaketudhāraṇī* existence as a woman for a woman departs without remainder. The organs of a woman having disappeared, the organs of a man appear; and that man is handsome with fully formed limbs. [Exactly the same idea is narratively expressed at *Rkp* 42.5, 44.1, 47.22, 50.13.]

SR XXXII 157-58:

mātṛgrāmo 'pidaṃ sūtraṃ śrutvā gāthāpi dhārayet
vivartayitvā strībhāvaṃ sa bhaved dharmabhāṇakaḥ //
na sā punopi strī[bhāva]m itaḥ paścād grahīṣyati
bhavet prāsādiko nityaṃ lakṣaṇaiḥ samalaṅkṛtaḥ //

Sgṭ 2158.7; Lhasa 187-3-7: of one zuṅ gi mdo'i chos kyi rnam graṅs 'di gaṅ gi rna lam du graṅs [rd: grags] par gyur pa [the Ms. is damaged here so I have given the Tib.] it is said: paṃcadaśa kalpasahasrāṇi na strībhāveṣūpa-[pa]tsyate.

SP 167.17: sacet punar nakṣatrarājasaṃkusumitābhijña mātṛgrāma: imaṃ dharmaparyāyaṃ śrutvodgrahīṣyati tasya sa eva paścimastrībhāvo bhaviṣyati.

(For a short paper which is pertinent to at least some aspects of these and similar passages see P.V.Bapat, "Change of Sex in Buddhist Literature", *Felicitation Volume Presented to S.K.Belvalker* (Banaras: 1957) 209-15).

If our texts provide any number of 'means' by which a woman could escape a repetition of her fate in the future, they are also concerned to provide the 'means' whereby she could cope with her fate in the present. Undoubtedly both the most important and at the same time the most traumatic concern of the woman at Gilgit would have been childbirth. And it is just this concern which our texts try to provide for. A particularly interesting passage of this kind is found in *Rkp*; it combines both the concern found in the passages quoted above and the concern with childbirth.

Rkp 41.1: ya[ḥ] kaścin mātrigrāmaḥ putrārthī bhavet tena snātvā navacīvara[ṃ] prāvṛtya brahmacāriṇā [pu]ṣpagandha-mālyavilepanair imaṃ pustakam arcayitvā svayaṃ nānāpuṣpa-samīrite nānāgandhapradhūpite nānārasaparivṛte āsane 'bhi-ruhyāyaṃ ratnaketudhāraṇī vācayitavyā / putrapratilābhī bhaviṣyati / eṣa (eva pa)ś(c)imo mātrigrāmabhāvo yāvad anuttaraparinirvāṇād anyatra svapraṇidhānāt satvapari-pācanaheto[ḥ]

[If] there would be some woman who desires a son, by her having bathed, having put on new clothes, being continent, having worshipped this book with flowers and perfumes and garlands and unguents, herself having mounted a seat strewn with various flowers, perfumed with various scents, covered with various pastes, this *Ratnaketudhāraṇī* is to be recited. She will come to be one who obtains a son. Just this will be (her) last existence as a woman until (her) utmost parinirvāṇa, apart from her own vow for the sake of maturing beings [which might involve rebirth as a woman].

Bhg also makes provision for the concern with childbirth:

Bhg [15]: '(And) any woman who at the time of giving birth experiences excessively sharp unpleasant feelings,(and) who worships and does pūjā to the Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguru-vaiḍūryaprabha, the Tathāgata, she is quickly freed. She will give birth to a son having all his limbs fully formed, handsome, beautiful, worthy of being seen, etc.'

At *SP* (Kern) 441.13-442.4 (the Gilgit Ms is damaged here) we find a similar passage stating that if a woman who desired a son performed homage (namaskāraṃ karoti) to Avalokita, she would bear a son who was handsome, beautiful, etc.; one who desired a daughter a[illegible]o saluted (abhinandati) Avalokita would get a daughter who was handsome, etc.: īdṛśaḥ kulaputrāvalokiteśvarasya bodhisattvasya mahāsattvasya prabhāvaḥ.

We can summarize the material quoted thus far in the following manner: 1) Existence as a woman was considered as an 'obstruction arising from past action', and was thus classified as one of the 'un-fortunate rebirths' which were to be avoided and from which one sought

release. It seems to have been conceived of as being somewhere between rebirth in the hells or among animals and true rebirth as a human. In this sense a woman was considered not fully human. 2) The primary reason for this valuation was the fact that the higher states open to humans, both secular and religious, were not open to women. A secondary, though important, reason appears to have been that since women were conventionally conceived of as obstacles to a man's religious development, to be reborn as a woman meant that one was born into a role in which the accumulation of demerit was especially likely. This is one side of the complex attitude maintained in our texts. The other side is that 3) all our texts exhibit a clear desire to provide for the needs of one born as a woman, both her religious and her secular needs, and to include women within their scheme of things. They provide a variety of means whereby she can escape a repetition of her fate; they also provide an equal variety of means by which she can cope with the anxiety and trauma surrounding her primary secular concern, childbirth.

Although I am aware that there are other aspects of the attitude towards women in Buddhist literature, those which I have indicated above are undoubtedly the most visible and representative of the literature found at Gilgit. I might, however, cite one further passage which is of interest.

The first part of *SP* ch. XIII, both prose and verse, is taken up with describing the proper behavior of one who wishes to teach this dharmaparyāya, with a decided emphasis on how he should behave in the presence of and towards women: he should avoid contact with them; if he has to preach to them or beg alms from them he should not do so alone; he should do so and not tarry or banter; he should always remain mindful of the Buddha while he is so engaged; etc. All of this is standard fare and, according to vs. 15, ācāragocaro hy eṣa prathamo, 'this is the first form of right conduct' taught by the Blessed One. Vss. 16-18 then say:

> yadā na carate dharme hīna-utkṛ[ṣṭamadhyame]
> saṃskṛtāsaṃskṛte cāpi bhūtābhūt(e ca) sarvaśaḥ // 16 //
>
> str[ī]ti nācarata dhīro puruṣeti na kalpayī
> sarvadharmān ajātatvād gaveṣanto na paśyati // 17 //
>
> ācāro hi ayaṃ ukto bodhisattvāna īdṛśaḥ

> When he never courses in a dharma, whether it be inferior, superior or medium, or conditioned or unconditioned, or true or false, // 16 //
>
> he, constant, would not behave (saying) 'This is a woman', nor would he discriminate (saying) 'This is a man'; inquiring, (still) he does not observe any dharma from the fact of its non-production. // 17 //
>
> This, indeed, is declared the kind of behavior for bodhisattvas.

Passages of this sort represent a kind of 'ideal' attitude which is met occasionally in predominantly Bodhic texts (cf. Lamotte, *Vimalakīrti* 280f and n.37), but I have noted only this one occurrence at Gilgit.

[5.9]

His ninth great vow was: "Being one who has obtained awakening[1)] *may I effect the release of beings] from the snares [of Māra]; may I establish*[2)] *those beings who have arrived at the impassable thicket*[3] *of the various views*[(2] *in a correct view*[(1]*; may I gradually show (them) the practice of a bodhisattva."*

1)(1 X: 'having turned all beings bound by the bonds and snares of Māra (and) arrived at the impassable straits of the various views away from all the snares of Māra and views, having urged (them) towards correct views', may I, etc. 2)(2 T: 'those who are in conflict through confused (?) conflicting multitudinous views'. 3) For -gahanasaṃkaṭa- the translation is only tentative. I have stuck pretty close to dictionary meanings, but there may be more than this involved; cf. Edgerton's remarks *BHSD* 211, s.v. gahanatā; also H.V.Guenther "Excerpts from the Gaṇḍavyūha Sūtra", in *Tibetan Buddhism in Western Perspective* (Emeryville: 1977) 20, 21: "the thicket of theorization", vividhadṛṣṭigahana.

There is also a reference to the 'snares of Māra' at *Bhg* [9]. There, as one of the results of hearing the name of Bhaiṣajyaguru, men reborn in hell will hear it again, will be reborn again among men, and will then - among other things - cchindanti mārapāśaṃ (see also *Bhg* [8]).

The reader at Gilgit would have been very familiar with Māra and the range of his activities. The defeat or subjugation of Māra is one of the central topics developed throughout *Rkp*. *AdP* i 7-10 and 32-35 deal in detail with the kinds of obstructions to the religious life which are 'the deeds of Māra' (cf. *SR* VI 7, 11), etc., etc.

There is a considerable number of secondary works on Māra. Most of these are cited in a recent article which deals in part with Māra, and which is of particular interest in reference to Gilgit: G.Fussman, "Pour une problématique nouvelle des religions indiennes anciennes", *JA* 265 (1977) 21-70; esp. 47-60.

[5.10]

His tenth great vow was: "When I have obtained awakening, whichever beings are frightened by a fear of kings, and which are bound or beaten or imprisoned, are condemned to death, tyrannized by numerous deceptions, looked down upon, wounded by sufferings of body and mind[1)]*, may they, through the power of my merit*[(1]*, be delivered from all (such) calamities."*

1)(1X: ...'may they, hearing my name, through the power of my merit', ...

The present vow is concerned with several situations which occur as items in the various lists of 'untimely deaths' (akālamaraṇas) or 'fears' (bhayas) which will be dealt with below. It also presents one side of the ambivalent attitude taken towards kings in the literature of Gilgit which will be discussed under [19].

[5.11]

His eleventh great vow was: "When I have obtained awakening, whichever beings burnt by the fire of hunger, intent upon getting food, [1)]commit an evil act[(1], [2]may I with food possessed of fine color and odor and flavor refresh their body; [3)]afterwards I establish (them) in endless ease through the flavor of dharma[(3]".

[1)(1]X: '.. do evil for that reason'. [2)]X: 'if they would preserve my name, may I with food, etc.' [3)(3]This entire clause is omitted in X.

This vow also concerns one of the 'untimely deaths', the ninth according to *Bhg* [20]: navamaṃ akālamaraṇaṃ ye kṣuttarṣopahatā āhāra-pānam alabhamānā kālaṃ kurvanti; cf. below.

Two additional points might be briefly noted here. First [5.11], like [5.7], implicitly recognizes - as I have stated above - a 'hierarchy of needs'; it acknowledges the fact that the individual's basic, or 'biological', needs must be met first before his more (conventionally understood) 'religious' needs can be attended to. This, I think, is also the essential meaning of [5.12]. It is important to repeat, however, that in the karmatically constructed world 'biological' and 'religious' are inextricably interlocked and would not have been perceived as separate or distinct categories.

A second and related point is that in [5.11], as in [5.7], [5.8] and [5.9] before it, we see how Bodhic concerns, if they occur at all, are articulated in karmatic texts. In all four passages bodhi, the bodhisattvacārikā, etc., are presented as an ultimate or final end or termination (bodhiparyavasāna), or as something arrived at only very gradually (anupūrvaṃ, cf. *Bbp* 1296.4/191-5-5f; 192-4-6f; cited above). Bodhic concerns, therefore, are not denied, they are only relieved of their immediacy, they are indefinitely postponed and projected into the future. It is interesting to observe that the position of bodhi here is virtually the same as the position of nibbāna in modern village Buddhism of South East Asia (cf. Spiro, *Buddhism and Society*, 76-84; Gombrich, *Precept and Practice*, 16-17; etc.).

[5.12]

1)*This was the twelfth great vow of that Tathāgata*(1*: "When I have obtained awakening, whichever beings, naked, without clothing, poor, experience day and night unpleasant feelings from cold and heat and flies and mosquitos,* 2*may I offer to them (*3*the enjoyment of garments colored with various colors...), and may* ʳ *with various jewels and ornaments and decorations and garlands and perfumes and unguents and music and tūryas and tāḍāvacaras fully fulfil all the inclinations of all beings."*

1)(1X: 'His twelfth great vow was:'; thus maintaining, unlike Y, the same formula found in [5.1-11]. 2)X: '.. if they would preserve my name, may I, etc.'. 3)That enclosed in parentheses is uncertain; see note 13 to the edition of the Skt. text.

[5.13]

These twelve great vows the Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabha, the Tathāgata, Arhat, Samyaksaṃbuddha, formerly practising the practice of a bodhisattva, has made.

---

[6]

Moreover, Mañjuśrī, it is not possible for that which is the vow and that which is the array of qualities of the buddhafield of that Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabha, the Tathāgata, to be exhausted in a kalpa or even more than a kalpa. That buddha-field is altogether purified[1]*, free of the defect of passion, free of (even) the word 'unfortunate rebirth' or 'suffering', free of women;* [2)]*and the earth (there) is made of beryl*[3]*, the walls and terraces and arches and lattices of windows and turrets are made of the seven precious things, (and also) the enclosure of pillars.*[(2] *As the world-sphere Sukhāvatī is, so is that world-sphere Vaiḍūrya-nirbhāsā. And there in that world-sphere there are two bodhisattvas, mahāsattvas, the foremost of his innumerable and incalculable bodhi-sattvas, the one called Sūryavairocana, the second, Candravairocana, who preserve the store of the Good Law of that Blessed One Bhaiṣajya-guruvaiḍūryaprabha, the Tathāgata. Therefore then, Mañjuśrī, a believing son or daughter of good family should make a vow for rebirth in that buddhafield.*

1) T adds: '(it is) devoid of stones, pebbles and gravel'. 2)(2 T: 'And the earth and walls and fences and arches and lattices of windows and turrets are made of beryl; and the enclosure of pillars is made of the seven precious things.' Stambhakhoṭaka, T: pu śu, has been trans-lated 'enclosure of pillars', but this is a guess; cf. *BHSD* 206 s.v. khoṭaka. 3) On vaiḍūrya see A.Master, "Indo-Aryan and Dravidian", *BSOAS* 11 (1943-46) 304-307.

---

a, The reader at Gilgit almost certainly would not have seen anything very special in Bhaiṣajyaguru's buddhafield as it is described here. In fact the description follows a pattern which would have been familiar to him from a number of other Gilgit texts, especially *SP*. It involves the

enumeration of more or less standard lists of both positive and negative characteristics. Of the negative characteristics we find, for example: apagatapāṣāṇaśarkarakaṭhallam, 'devoid of stones, pebbles and gravel (cf. Tib in n.1 above)': apagataśvabhraprapātam, 'devoid of pits and precipices'; apagatasyandanikāgūthoḍillam, 'devoid of drains and cess-pools', all of the future buddhafield of the Śrāvaka Kāsyapa (*SP* 67.10); apagatanirayatiryagyoniyamalokāsurakāyam, 'devoid of hells, animal births, the world of Yama and the totality of Asuras', applied to the future buddhafield of the Śrāvaka Mahākātyāyana (*SP* 70.28); apagatāpāyaṃ, 'devoid of unfortunate rebirths'; apagatamātṛgrāmaṃ 'devoid of women', of the future buddhafield of Pūrṇa-maitrāyaṇīputra (*SP* Kern ed.) 202.5); apagatamātṛgrāmam and apagatatiryagyonipretāsurakāya, of a buddhafield of a former Tathāgata; of the future buddhafield of Bali, the Asurendra, tatra tava buddhakṣetre na rāgaśabdo na dveṣaśabdo na mohaśabdo bhaviṣyati (*Kv* 275.26); etc. For the positive characteristics I will cite only one example:

> ... virajaṃ nāma buddhakṣetraṃ bhaviṣyati samaṃ ramaṇīyaṃ prāsādikaṃ prasadanīyaṃ pariśuddhaṃ ṛddhaṃ ca sphītaṃ ca kṣe[maṃ] ca subhikṣaṃ ca bahunarāmarūprakīrṇaṃ ca vaiḍūryamayaṃ suvarṇasūtrāṣṭāpadavinaddhaṃ, sarvatra cāṣṭāpadasmiṃ ratnavṛkṣo bhaviṣyati saptānāṃ ratnānāṃ puṣpaphalaiḥ satatasamitaṃ sama[r]p[i]taḥ

> ... that buddhafield will be named Viraja, (it will be) level, delightful, attractive, charming, very pure, and prosperous and flourishing and secure and abounding in food and crowded with a multitude of men and gods; it will be made of beryl, laid out in a checker-board pattern of eight squares marked with gold thread; in each square there will be a jewel tree filled continually with flowers and fruits of the seven precious things. (*SP* 205.32; also 67.9, 69.10, 70.28, 72.2, 100.14, 160.18; etc.)

One other case deserves to be mentioned here. I have already indicated above that the descriptions of 'the future world of Maitreya' and the city of Ketumatī have much in common with the descriptions of Mahāyāna buddhafields. To what extent this is so can now be seen by citing some of the characteristics of that 'world' from *Mvk*. The passage in

which the description of 'the world of Maitreya' occurs has not been preserved in either the Gilgit Ms. or the Nepalese Ms. of *Mvk*, so I give here Lévi's translation of the Tibetan: "Et cette Ile-du-Jambu, aplanie sur toute son étendue ... les hommes des pays, prodigieusement multipliés, sont innombrables ... Le sol est sans épines, uni ... Les arbres, qui ont à la fois feuilles, fleurs et fruits, poussent à la hauteur d'une portée de voix ... Ces créatures sont sans tare, sans mal, pleines d'entrain; leur corps est grand, avec un beau teint; ils ont des forces extraordinaires; en fait de maladies, trois seulement se manifestent: les besoins, l'inanition, la vieillesse. Les femmes, quand elles arrivent à cinq cents ans, prennent alors seulement un mari ... Cette ville se montre ravissante ... Ses hautes murailles, fautes des sept joyaux, montent à une portée de voix. Ses terrasses, ses portes sont décorées de toutes sortes de pierreries, etc." Although the description of 'the world of Maitreya' is a little more restrained and conservative, a little less developed than the Mahāyāna descriptions of buddhafields, when seen from the point of view of the reader at Gilgit it appears highly likely that he would have immediately assimilated the former to the latter, would in fact, have seen them as only two examples of the same basic thing. This assimilation would have been made all the easier by the fact that the two - in addition to being physically similar - were *functionally* almost identical. (On the 'Paradise of Maitreya', and especially the development it underwent, see P.Demiéville, "La Yogācārabhūmi de Saṅgharakṣa", *BEFEO* 44 (1954) 376-95; for some pictorial representations see L.Bachhofer,"'Maitreya in Ketumatī' by Chu Hao-ku", *India Antiqua* (Leiden: 1947) 1-7; for the "Paradise" of Bhaiṣajyaguru see A.Waley, *A Catalogue of Paintings Recovered from Tun-Huang by Sir Aurel Stein* (London: 1931) 62f, 179, 288.)

b. One other element in the description of Bhaiṣajyaguru's buddhafield is of particular interest; this is the simile 'as the world-sphere Sukhāvatī is, so is that world-sphere Vaiḍūryanirbhāsā'. At first sight such a passage seems to indicate a direct influence of the cult of Amitābha as it is found in texts such as the *Sukhāvatīvyūha*, and so at least Soper has taken it (*Literary Evidence for Early Buddhist Art in China* (Ascona: 1959) 172f.). But I have already indicated that I think something quite different is involved (G.Schopen, "Sukhāvatī as a Generalized Religious Goal in Sanskrit Mahāyāna Literature", *IIJ* 19 (1977) 194f.). In *IIJ* 19 I was able to cite - in addition to passages from the *Ārya-saptatathāgata-pūrvapraṇidhānaviśeṣavistara-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra*, Pek. vol.6, no.135,

129-3-5f; and the *Mañjuśrībuddhakṣetraguṇavyūha*, Pek. vol.23, no.760(15), 126-5-2 - only one strictly parallel passage from Gilgit. This was *Aj* 112.14:

> atha sā dārikā bhagavantaṃ triṣpradakṣiṇaṅ kṛtvaivam āha · kīdṛśaṃ bhagavaṃ mama buddhakṣetraṃ bhaviṣyati yatraivāhaṃ buddho bhaviṣyāma · bhagavān āha · aparimitaguṇasaṃcayā nāma sā buddhakṣetraṃ bhaviṣyati: yādṛśā ca sā sukhāvatī lokadhātu tādṛśaṃ tad buddhakṣetraṃ bhaviṣyati · paryaṃkaniṣaṇṇā aupapādukā bodhisatvā bhaviṣyaṃti · īdṛśaṃ tad buddhakṣetraṃ - //
>
> Then that girl, having three times circumambulated the Blessed One, spoke thus: O Blessed One, what will my buddhafield be like, where I will be a Buddha ? The Blessed One said: Aparamitaguṇasaṃcayā will that buddhafield be named; and as is that world-sphere Sukhāvatī, so will that buddhafield be. Bodhisattvas will be miraculously born seated cross-legged. Such is that buddhafield.

To this I would now add:

> *Rkp* 107.9; Pek. 198-1-6: (atha khalu jyotīraso bodhisattvo mahāsat)-tvo bhagavantam etad avocat: kīdṛśaṃ bhagavan tad buddhakṣetraṃ bhaviṣyati yatrāhan dharmacak(r)aṃ pravartiṣye. bhagavā(n āha:) ... (the Ms is damaged here; Tib. continues thus:) khyod ni bskal pa graṅs med dpag tu med pa na / byaṅ phyogs su saṅs rgyas kyi źiṅ me tog rgyas pa'i dri źes bya ba 'byuṅ ste / saṅs rgyas kyi źiṅ de ni ji ltar da ltar gyi 'jig rten gyi khams bde ba can bźin du bkod pa de lta bu daṅ ldan par 'gyur ro /
>
> Then the bodhisattva, mahāsattva, Jyotīrasa said to the Blessed One: 'O Blessed One, of what kind will that buddhafield be where I will turn the wheel of dharma?' The Blessed One said: 'You, in immeasurable and incalculable kalpas, in the northern direction, will appear in a buddhafield named me tog rgyas pa'i dri; as is the world-sphere Sukhāvatī now, so that buddhafield will be possessed of such an array (of qualities).

and:

> *Sgt* 2170.3 (= 2003.3); Lhasa 189-3-1: śṛṇu sarvaśūra ye kecid asmāt saṃghāṭadharmaparyāyād ekākṣaram api catuṣpadikāṃ gāthāṃ likhiṣyanti teṣāṃ sarvaśūra satvānāṃ tataḥ paścāt [omitted at 2003.5] paṃcana-

vatikoṭīsahasrāṇi lokadhātūnām atikramya yathā sukhāvatī lokadhātus tathā teṣāṃ buddhakṣetraṃ bhaviṣyati · teṣāṃ ca sarvaśūra satvānāṃ caturaśītiḥ kalpasahasrāṇy āyuṣpramāṇaṃ bhaviṣyati.

Listen, O Sarvaśūra: whosoever will copy even a single syllable (or) a gāthā of four lines from this discourse on dharma (named) *Saṃghāṭa*, for those beings, having passed thence westward beyond ninety-five koṭīs of thousands of world-spheres, as is the world-sphere Sukhāvatī, so will be their buddhafield ...

Sgṭ 2209.7-2210.5 (= 2037.6-2038.2); Lhasa 194-3-1f: ye sarvaśūra satvā evaṃ vāg bhāṣante: asti dharmaḥ asti dharmāṇāṃ pāragaḥ te tena kuśalamūlena viṃśatikalpāṇy uttarakuruṣūpapatsyante · paṃca-viṃśatikalpasahasrāṇi trāyastriṃśānān devānāṃ saha bhāvyatāyām upapatsyante · trayatriṃśadbhyo devebhyaś cyavitvā uttarakuruṣūpa-patsyante · na ca mātuḥ kukṣāv upapatsyante · lokadhātuśatasahasraṃ ca drakṣyanti · sarve sukhāvatī nāmānaṃ sarvabuddhakṣetrasandarśanan dṛṣṭvā tatraiva pratiṣṭhānaṃ kṛtvā tatraiva bodhim abhisaṃbhotsyate ·

Sarvaśūra, which beings would speak thus: 'There is dharma; there is a going to the other shore of dharmas'; they through this root of merit will be reborn in the Uttarakurus for twenty kalpas. For twenty-five thousand kalpas they will be reborn together with the devas of the thirty-three. Having passed away from among the devas of the thirty-three, they will be reborn in the Uttarakurus, and they will not be reborn in the womb of a woman. And they will see hundreds of thousands of world-spheres; all these are named Sukhāvatī; having seen the appearance of all these buddhafields, having established a foundation there, just there they will fully awaken to awakening.

The one other related passage cited in *IIJ* 19 from Gilgit is from *Bbp*. I give here my translation of it as it appeared in *JIP* 6:

Bbp 1288 (Then at that time by the Blessed One the grove of Āmrapālī with Jambudvīpa) was magically transformed [so that it was] of an extension (of as much as several hundreds of thousands of niyutas of yojanas), being smooth like the palm of a hand, heavenly, pleasing to the mind, possessed of [fine] color, (ornamented with) heavenly flower trees and perfume trees and

(fruit trees and jewel trees and wish-fulfilling trees and cloth trees), possessed of heavenly lion thrones, being hung with garlands (of flowers) and cloth and jewels, being adorned with the sound of garlands of bells. Just as (is the world-sphere Sukhāvatī, so [that] was ravishing), satisfying, charming, delightful.

Since I have already discussed a number of these passages, and since *Ṛkp* 107.9, *Sgṭ* 2170.3 and 2209.7 only serve to confirm what I have said, it will be sufficient to here quote my conclusions:

> "It seems, then, that the idea of *Sukhāvatī* was generalized to the point that it became a standard literary simile for magnificence, loveliness, etc., much in the same way as comparison with Mt. Meru became the standard literary simile for unshakeability or imperturbability; and in the same way that the Mt. Meru referred to in the simile has lost any specific association with the old and intricate cosmology of which it originally formed a part, so here *Sukhāvatī* has lost any specific association with the cult of Amitābha."

These considerations make it fairly sure that, as I have said above, the reader at Gilgit would not have seen anything very special in Bhaiṣajyaguru's buddhafield as it is described in *Bhg*. It would have been seen only as one example among many. The only thing that is at all unique to it are the proper names: the name of Bhaiṣajyaguru, of the field itself, and of the two chief bodhisattvas, Sūryavairocana and Candravairocana. Neither, as far as I know, occur elsewhere at Gilgit or in Mahāyāna literature as a whole.

These passages also indicate that the conception of buddhafields was firmly established and widespread at Gilgit, and that this conception pictured the buddhafield as an ideal state, *both* materially and spiritually. This, of course, accounts for the fact that rebirth in a buddhafield was both actively sought and presented as a vipāka of religious acts. The former aspect is seen both here in *Bhg* [6] and later in [11] where individuals form vows (praṇidhāna) for rebirth in a buddhafield. It is also underscored by the fact that at *StA* 51.12 Avalokita explicitly says that one of the reasons he asks the Blessed One for the teaching (i.e. *StA* as a whole) is to make possible a rebirth in a buddhafield for

'beings'; and at *StA* 56.11 it is said that the particular mantrapadas in question were spoken and empowered (adhiṣṭhita) by the Tathāgatas 'to effect a rebirth in a buddhafield' (buddhakṣetropapattaye). These and related points will be discussed further under [11].

[7]

Once again the Blessed One addressed Mañjuśrī, the true heir-apparent: 'It happens, Mañjuśrī, that beings who do not understand (the significance of) a good or bad act, overcome by covetousness, not understanding the act of giving nor the maturation of the fruit of the act of giving - childish, dull, having defective faculties of faith - are intent on piling up and protecting possessions, and their thought does not go towards a distribution of gifts. When an occasion for giving arises they are not at all happy, as if in (giving they were) cutting flesh from their own body. And there are many of these beings who even themselves do not themselves enjoy (their possessions)[1]*. How much less (is that so) of their male and female slaves and workmen, how much less (is that so) of other beggars*[1]*. Beings of that kind, having passed away from here, will be reborn in the world of the pretas or among animals. (But) by which of these, when formerly they were men, the name of that Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabha, the Tathāgata, will have been heard, to them now dwelling in the world of Yama, or dwelling among animals, the name of that Tathāgata will (again) come to be present. Immediately, through (that name) being merely recalled, having passed away from there, they will once again be reborn among men; and they will be such as have recollection of (their former) births. Terrified by the fear of an unfortunate destiny, no longer seeking for the objects of desire, delighted in the act of giving and proclaimers of the praise of the act of giving, renouncing all their property, in due order they will present to beggars their head or hands or feet or eyes or flesh and blood, how much more other accumulations of material goods.*

1)(1 X, Z and T all expand this passage and tighten up the meaning. X: 'How much less will they give (them) to their mother and father, how much less to their male and female slaves, how much less to other beggars'. Z and T: 'How much less will they give (them) to their mother or father or wife or sons or daughters, how much less, etc.'. Y may be corrupt here.

---

a. As in most of Mahāyāna sūtra literature, there are many references to the act of giving in our Gilgit texts, and we might look briefly at some of these. On the whole these passages tend to fall into three groups. The first group consists of passages in which the practice of giving is recommended and its rewards enumerated. Good examples of this kind of passage are *Mvk* 71, where the gift of robes, medicine and food to the Saṃgha is one of the acts resulting in rebirth in Maitreya's 'world'; *Aj* 118.1.4, where it is said that he who would give gifts to the bhikṣusaṃgha is protected from yakṣas, rakṣas, etc.; *Aj* 118.17, where he who would give alms is freed from old age and disease; *Aj* 126.8, where the giving of gifts to the bhikṣusaṃgha is said to result in going quickly to Sukhāvatī. A good example from a Bodhic text is

> *SR* 329.11f: 'There are ten blessings for the bodhisattva, mahāsattva, devoted to the practice of giving. What ten ? Namely: for him the depravity of envy is suppressed; and his thought is always devoted to giving up (things); and he receives the best of things common to the mass of men; and he is reborn among families of great wealth; and immediately upon birth the thought of giving up (things) presents itself; he is dear to the fourfold assembly; and self-confident and uncowed he enters into the assembly; everywhere in the world the highest words of praise and fame for him arise; and he has soft and tender hands and feet (mṛdutaruṇahastapādaś ca bhavati); he is firmly fixed and flat-footed (samacaraṇatalapratiṣṭhitaḥ); and he is never separated from the good spiritual friends until he is seated on the terrace of enlightenment.

Vaj 12a6 is characteristic of the second group:

> Once again, Subhūti, which bodhisattva, mahāsattva, having filled immeasurable and incalculable world-spheres with the seven precious things, would give them as a gift; and which son or

daughter of good family, having taken from this Perfection of Wisdom only as much as a verse of four lines, would recite it, would teach, would study it; just this latter would generate a much greater merit, immeasurable, incalculable.

Such passages, where the merit from activity undertaken in reference to a text - reciting, copying, worshipping, etc. - is compared to the merit of giving gifts, always to the latter's disadvantage, are very common (cf. *Vaj* 12a.6; *Sgṭ* 2165.1; *StA* 63.8, 63.17, 78.15, 81.6; *SR* XXXVI 5; *SP* 123.1f; 129.18; 165.19; etc.). These passages, at first sight, might be taken as an indication of a shift in the value attached to giving. But that this is not altogether the case is clear from the fact that the entire effectiveness of the comparison depends on the practice of dāna being conceived of as highly meritorious. The mere fact it was chosen as the first member of the comparison indicates its continuing importance. It is also interesting to note that this comparison was also applied to things other than activity directed towards texts: at *Vaj* 11a.4 the comparison is between one who gives gifts and a bodhisattva who would obtain patience in dharmas devoid of a self (nirātmakeṣu dharmeṣu kṣāntiṃ pratilabheta; the later redaction and Pargiter's Ms. have nirātmakeṣv anutpattikeṣu dharmeṣu, etc.); at *SR* XXXVI 39-42 it is between one who gives gifts and which bhikṣu, absorbed in emptiness, would honor the Buddhas with his hands in añjali (yaś caiva bhikṣur abhiratu śūnyatāyām / buddhān namasye daśanakhaprāñjalīyo).

Before moving to the third group of passages it is worth citing an interesting passage from *Kv* which appears as a kind of combination of the characteristics of the first and second group.

Kv 271.20f: Then Avalokiteśvara the bodhisattva, mahāsattva, spoke thus to the king Bali, the leader of the Asuras: O Great King, who in the presence of beings produces a thought of non-injury, presents alms to the 'religion' of the Tathāgata (tathāgataśāsane), (and) performs much homage and service, no one can harm them even in a dream. And those who copy this *Kāraṇḍavyūha*, the king of the jewels of the Mahāyāna sūtras, who have it copied, even as little as its name, (who) listen to this discourse on dharma, (and) present only a single gift of alms to a bodhisattva and to the dharma-reciters and the preservers, reciters, copiers and hearers of this

discourse on dharma, and (who) present alms for only the morning meal-time, or for a single day, in the name of (uddiśya) this discourse on dharma of the Tathāgata, they all will obtain the kingship of a cakravartin, and nowhere will they experience suffering from hunger or thirst, and they will nowhere experience the suffering of detention in a hell or that arising from separation from that which is dear. They will be freed from all suffering. They will go to the world-sphere of Sukhāvatī, and having heard dharma face-to-face from the Blessed One Amitābha, the Tathāgata, they will obtain a prediction. And further, O Great King, listen to the fruit of the act of giving: ... [then follows a long series of comparisons, such as:] ... 'I am able to grasp the number of the finest atoms of matter, but, O son of good family, I am unable to calculate the mass of merit from the gift of alms .

The third and final group of passages is that in which the attitude towards dāna which Bodhic Buddhism wanted to inculcate is expressed. Here we find, for example, as the first of the ten blessings (anuśaṃsa) of the bodhisattva who has coursed in wisdom (prajñācaritasya): sarvasvaparityāgo bhavati na ca dānena śuddhiṃ manyate: 'He gives up all of his possessions, but he does not think that purification (arises) through giving' (*SR* 340.2); and at *SR* XXXII 190: na svargahetoś carati sa brahmacaryaṃ / na svargalolo dadati sada nu vijñaḥ / saṃbodhikāmaḥ kuśalacariṃ carantaḥ (Nepalese redaction: saṃbodhikāmo dadati sa bodhisattvaḥ /: 'He (the bodhisattva) does not practise the religious life for the sake of heaven; never does a wise one give gifts desiring heaven, (but) seeking complete awakening, practising the good practice, etc. (Nepalese: '(but) seeking complete awakening that bodhisattva gives gifts'). We also find passages such as:

SR VI 3: sacet punar jāna[ti nāsti sattvo
yo gandha detī tatha yasya dīyate
e]tena cittena dadāti gandham
eṣāsya kṣāntir mṛdu ānulomikī //

If he understands 'there is no being who gives perfume, so also (none) to whom it is given', (and) with this thought he gives perfume, this of him is the pliant (and) conforming patience.

And, finally:

> *AdP* i 174.4: iha subhūte bodhisattvo mahāsattva prathamacittotpādam upādāya dānapāramitāyāṃ caraṃ sarvākārajñatā-(pratisaṃyuktair manasikārair dānaṃ dadāti) ... na cāsya dāne (dānasaṃjñā bhavati, na pratigrāhake pratigrāhakasaṃjñā bhavati, na dā)yake dāyakasaṃjñā bhavati ... na ca dānaphalam āśaṃsate yad dānaphalaṃ saṃsāre paribhuṃjīta-anyatra sattvaparitrāṇatāyai sattvapa(rimocanatāyai dānapāramitāyāṃ carati.
>
> Here, Subhūti, a bodhisattva, mahāsattva, beginning from the first thought (directed towards awakening), practising in the perfection of giving, with thoughts joined to the knowledge of all modes, gives a gift ... and he has no perception of the act of giving in the act of giving, no perception of a recipient in the recipient, no perception of a giver in the giver ... and he does not hope for a fruit of the act of giving in such a way that he could enjoy that fruit of the act of giving in saṃsāra. He practises in the perfection of giving only for the sake of helping and releasing beings.

In all three kinds of passages dāna is presented as an important religious practice. But we also see here, especially in passages of the third kind, an explicit distinction made between one who practises giving 'desiring heaven' (svargalola), one who practises it 'seeking complete awakening' (saṃbodhikāma), and one who practises giving, 'but does not hope for a fruit from that act of giving' (na ca dānaphalam āśamsate). The implications of this important distinction will be studied below in detail in reference to the related practice of pūjā. Here it is sufficient to note that our texts are fully aware of the intentional component inherent in religious activity, and that some of them *(SR, AdP)* implicitly criticize what I would call the karmatic conception of giving (i.e. that expressed in *Mvk* 71, *Aj* 118.1-4; 126.8; *Kv* 271.20).

Finally, it should be added that sarvasvaparityāga, 'giving up the totality of one's possessions', including wife, sons, daughters, hands, feet, eyes, etc., as here in *Bhg* [7], was always the *ideal* form of giving in Buddhist literature (for this, and a rich discussion of the place of dāna in general, see H.Dayal, *The Bodhisattva Doctrine in Buddhist Sanskrit Literature* (London: 1932) 172-93; also Ét.Lamotte, "La bienveillance

bouddhique", *BCLS* 38 (1952) 381-403; "Le suicide religieux dans le bouddhisme ancien", *BCLS* 51 (1965) 156-68).

* * * *

b. A second important point to be noted concerning *Bhg* [7] is one which we have already had occasion to mention. Both here and in the next few sections the author of *Bhg* has given us a good idea of the way in which the 'vow' connected with hearing the name of Bhaiṣajyaguru was thought 'to work', especially in reference to its relationship to the maturation of the individual's 'past action'. The 'idea' is most easily expressed by contrasting two sequences of events. The first is that into which the hearing of the name does not enter: a man is ignorant of karma and the fruits of karma; he avoids his opportunities to make merit and hoards his possessions; as a consequence he is reborn in an unfortunate state. But once born into the hells, among animals, etc., it was difficult to explain how the individual could ever escape from them since the unfortunate states were situations which allowed little opportunity for making merit and great opportunities for accumulating further demerit. This in fact - as is well known - was a major weakness in the karmatic account of things, one which sometimes made it appear, at least, as very close to a kind of determinism. It is interesting to note that the 'vow' of Bhaiṣajyaguru intervenes at just this weak point. This is clear from a second sequence, the one actually found in *Bhg* [7]: a man is ignorant of karma and the fruits of karma; he avoids his opportunities to make merit and hoards his possessions; *but* - and this is the introduction of the new element - at some point in his existence as a man he hears the name of Bhaiṣajyaguru. This, however, does not affect the next event in the sequence: he is of *necessity* reborn in an unfortunate state. But here in this second sequence his future course is not ambiguous or uncertain: although he must undergo the maturation of his past acts, because he heard or was caused to hear the name of Bhaiṣajyaguru when a man, he will recall it again in his unfortunate state; having recalled it he will be again reborn among men and *importantly*, he will obtain jātismara, 'the recollection of his former birth(s)'. Through this 'recollection' he is fully aware of his former 'fate' (i.e. 'he understands the significance of a good or bad action') and is terrified by the possibility of its repetition; as a consequence he practises dāna, even

in its most austere form, and the circle is broken. The 'vow' of Bhaiṣajyaguru, then, functions to assure the individual who has heard his name of an *eventual* release from what otherwise appeared as an unavoidable and 'eternal' repetition of his unfortunate 'fate'. A few additional passages will both further clarify the pattern here envisioned and once again establish the fact that Bhaiṣajyaguru was not unique in fulfilling this function.

One of the most interesting texts in this regard is *Bbp*. After describing a ritual very similar to that found in *Bhg* which is to be performed for the sake of those reborn in the Avīci hell or in the three unfortunate destinies the text says:

> *Bbp* 193-3-4f (the Tibetan text is cited above p.183-84)
>
> ... Through the power of the vows of those former Tathāgatas [i.e. Bhaiṣajyaguru, Amitābha, Śikhin, Viśvabhū, and the long list of other Tathāgatas named at 192-5-3], (their) names would be heard in the ears of those gone to the Avīci hell and those born in the three unfortunate destinies. Through the power of this discourse on dharma, moreover, all evil would be checked. Through the power of the majesty of those Tathāgatas, and through the power of this discourse on dharma, having recollected (their) good and bad acts [i.e., the fruits thereof], they consequently would not perform evil acts. From that they would be freed from all suffering and would go to a fortunate destiny. Until they fully and completely awaken to utmost, right and complete awakening, they would conform to this practice.

A little further on the same thing is repeated in verse, the important padas for us being: sṅon gyi las rnams rjes su dran 'gyur źiṅ / dran nas mkhas pa sdig pa byed mi 'gyur: '(they) would recollect their former acts [i.e. the fruits thereof]; having recollected (that), the wise would not (again) perform evil'.

In addition to this we find two other passages of interest at Gilgit, one from *Sgṭ* and one from *Rkp*.

> *Sgṭ* 2129.5: evam eva sarvaśūra sa saddharmapratikṣepakaḥ puruṣo yadā narake duḥkhaṃ smarati tadā sarvapāpaṃ parivarjayati · yadā sarvapāpaṃ parivarjayati tadā sarvadharmā āmukhī-

karisyati · sarvadharmā āmukhīkrtvā sarvakuśaladharma pāripūriṅkarisyati ·

Just so, Sarvaśūra, the man who rejects the Good Law, when he recollects the suffering in hell, then he avoids all evil; when he avoids all evil, then all dharmas will be made manifest; all dharmas having been made manifest, he will fulfil all good dharmas.

Rkp 18.8: ekaikasmāc ca lakṣaṇād bhagavatas tādṛśī prabhā niścacāra yayā prabha[yā] (t)r(sāhasramahāsāhasrī lokadhātur u)dāreṇāvabhāsena sphuṭo 'bhūt. ye cāsyāṃ trisāhasramahāsāhasryāṃ lokadhātau devanāgayakṣagandharvāsuragaruḍakinnaramahoraga-pretapiśācaku(mbhāṇḍamanuṣyāmanuṣyā nairayikā vā tairyagyonikā vā yāmalaukikā vā te sarve bhagavaṃtam adrākṣuḥ ... bahūni ca nairayikatairyagyonikayāmalaukikākṣobhyakoṭīśatasahasrāṇi smṛtiṃ pratilebhire; pūrvāvaropitakuśala(mūlam) anusmṛtya namo buddhāyeti kṛtvā tebhyo 'pāyebhyaś cavitvā deveṣūpapannāḥ.

And from each of the marks of the Blessed One such a light was shot forth that the three-thousand-great-thousand world-sphere was suffused with great radiance. And those devas, nāgas, yakṣas, etc., who were in the three-thousand-great-thousand world-sphere, and those born in the hells or among animals or in the world of Yama, they all saw the Blessed One ... and many akṣobhyas of koṭīs of hundreds of thousands of those born in the hells or among animals or in the world of Yama obtained recollection; having obtained recollection of the roots of merit which they had formerly planted, having made the 'namo buddhāya', having passed away from those unfortunate rebirths, they were reborn among devas.

Finally, we may now cite what is, from the point of view of the 'cult' of Bhaiṣajyaguru, one of the most important passages in the whole of *Bhg*. Here at [17] it is said that 'friends, relatives and kinsmen' (Y: ye, but X makes this more specific: mitrajñātisālohita) perform a specific pūjā to Bhaiṣajyaguru for the sake of a man who has just died and undergone his 'judgement' in the presence of Yama. When the pūjā is performed, the text says,... 'the case does occur where his consciousness

could just return again (i.e., immediately, punar eva pratinivarteta); he (then) becomes aware of himself (i.e., of his experiences before Yama) as if in a dream. Or if on the seventh day, or if on the twenty-first or thirty-fifth or forty-ninth day his consciousness would be reborn again, he would obtain recollection. He himself is a witness to (the effects of) merit, demerit, (and) the maturation of past actions. (As a consequence) even for the sake of his life he does not do an evil deed'.

In addition to fuller passages like those cited above, we can also note that jātismara is often found among the lists of 'blessings' said to follow from religious acts. We might look at a few of these because once again they indicate that the individual at Gilgit had at hand - in addition to the pūjās directed toward Bhaiṣajyaguru, Amitābha, Śikhin, Viśvabhū, etc. - a number of means through which he could obtain this faculty. We find, for example, at *Bbp* 194-1-1 that 'if someone preserves, worships, copies, etc., this discourse on dharma, they will obtain eight great blessings', the last of which is ji ltar 'dod pa'i gnas su skye źiṅ tshe rabs dran par 'gyur ba ste: 'they are born in a place in accordance with their desire and they will recollect their former births'; at *Kv* 269.19 those who hear, and having heard, copy, preserve, worship the text: teṣāṃ ca pañcānantaryāṇi karmāṇi kṣapayanti kṣapayitvā pariśuddhakāyā bhaviṣyanti jātismarāś ca: 'for them the five acts of immediate retribution will be exhausted; after having exhausted (these), they will come to be purified in body and have recollection of their former births'; at *Kv* 278.32 those who have the text copied: yatra yatropapadyante tatra tatra jātau jātau jātismarā bhavanti; at *Sgṭ* 2122.1 it is said that 'he who will wholeheartedly reverence (adhyāśayena namaskariṣyati) the *Sgṭ*: paṃcanavatikalpāṃ jātau jātismaro bhaviṣyati; at *Sgṭ* 2158.7 (= 1991.5), Lhasa 187-3-7, we find: yaṃ [but T: gaṅ gi] saṃghāṭo dharmaparyāyaḥ śrotrāvabhāsam āgamiṣyati, so 'śītiḥ kalpāṃ jātismaro [2159.1: jātyājātismaro; T: tshe rabs dran par] bhaviṣyati; at *Sgṭ* 2254.3: bhagavān āha · śṛṇu bhaiṣajyasena sa puruṣo maraṇakālasamaye jīvitād vyavaropyamāṇas tathāgatasyoparicittaṃ prasādyaivaṃ vācam abhāṣataḥ namas tasya bhagavate tathāgatasyārhataḥ samyaksaṃbuddhasyety ekavācā kṛ(tvā) sa tena bhaiṣajyasena kuśalamūlena ṣaṣṭiḥ kalpān trāyastriṃśatāṃ devānāṃ sukham anubhaviṣyati · aśītiḥ kalpāṃ jātyājātismaro bhaviṣyati.

All of our passages indicate that the possession of jātismara was considered beneficial. They also indicate that the individual could obtain it in two ways: as a result of action undertaken for his own benefit (*Bbp* 194-1-1, *Kv* 269.19, 278.32; *Sgṭ* 2122.1, 2254.3); and as a result of action undertaken for his benefit by another (*Bhg* [17], and probably [7], *Bbp* 193-3-4, *Ṛkp* 18.8). We saw the same pattern above under *Bhg* [5.6]. More importantly, these passages, especially the first group, give us a good idea of why jātismara was considered to be important. They indicate the pivotal significance it had, or could have, for the sequential process by which the individual 'determined' his future life-situation, both spiritual and material. Its presence or absence could, or did, have a decided influence on whether or not the individual, once he had again obtained a human birth, would alter his previous course of behaviour. The possession of 'the recollection of one's past births' ensured that the reality or actuality of 'the Law of Karma' was immediately, painfully, irrefutably brought home to the individual. As a result of the certainty, based on recollected 'personal' experience, that one's actions 'determined' one's life-situation, the individual, according to our texts, aware of his past suffering, would alter his behaviour in such a way as to avoid a repetition of that suffering. Although negatively phrased, the result, of course, is positive 'religious' development. (cf. P.Demiéville, "Sur la mémoire des existences antérieures", *BEFEO* 27 (1927) 283-98).

If these passages indicate the pivotal significance of jātismara, they also indicate in what sense the individual can be said to be 'saved' through religious activity undertaken in regard to Bhaiṣajyaguru, Amitābha, etc., or in regard to the dharmaparyāya-Buddha. Such activity has two significant results. It ensures that the individual, although he must undergo the consequences of his past acts, will at some point obtain a state in which he can alter his course. And it makes it possible for the individual to have a full and direct awareness of the consequences of his acts which is otherwise unavailable to him. This, however, does not relieve the individual of the responsibility for his future development. He is 'provided' with the best possible circumstances and the clearest possible view of the behavioral alternatives and their consequences; that is all. According to the texts, however, that 'clarity of view' almost invariably results in the abandonment of unmeritorious action and, therefore, continued development in a positive direction.

But, and this is important, the individual alone must be the actual agent in any continued development. This is very different from what is generally understood when we say that by such activity the individual is 'saved' and, I think, we are here not nearly as far from the Buddhism of the Nikāyas as might at first sight appear. In fact, obtaining jātismara is, in at least some important ways, the functional equivalent of realizing a central dictum of what has been preserved as Śākyamuni's teaching: imasmiṃ sati idaṃ hoti, imass' uppādā idaṃ uppajjati.

[8]

Again further, Mañjuśrī[1], it happens that beings who in the name of the Tathāgata preserve (outwardly) the rule of training are gone wrong in morality, in behaviour, in views[(1]. Again, those who are possessed of morality guard morality, (but) they do not seek great learning and do not know the deep meaning of the sūtras of the Tathāgatas. And those who have great learning, they will become conceited; stiff with pride, disliked by all, they repudiate, they reject the Good Law. Partisans of Māra, such deluded men have themselves entered on a wrong path and cause many koṭis of nayutas of hundreds of thousands of other beings to take a great fall. For such beings almost certainly[2] there will be a destiny in the hells. By which of those, (however), the name of the Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabha, the Tathāgata, will have been heard [when formerly they were men[3]], to them now dwelling in a hell the name of that Tathāgata, through the power of the Buddha, will (again) come to be present. They, having passed away from that place, will once again be born in the world of men. Possessed of the correct view, of vigor, of good intentions, they, having renounced the household life, having gone forth in the teaching of the Tathāgatas, in due course will practise[4] the practice of a bodhisattva.

1)(1 T: '(Again, Mañjuśrī), which are those beings who violate the rule of training of the Tathāgatas, they enter on wrong morality and enter on wrong views'. X and Z differ from Y in 'style', but not in sense. 2) I am sure of neither the form bhūyiṣṭa-tara, nor its exact significance. I assume that bhūyiṣṭha-tara was intended, but both Y and Z appear to have -iṣṭa-, although the difference between subscribed -ṭa- and -ṭha- in the script is often very slight. T has: 'such beings will go to a/the intolerable hell'. 3) So T and *Bhg* [7] and [9]. 4) X: 'will fulfil'.

Neither [8] nor [9] require much comment. They are only further illustrations of much that has already been said, especially in the last note. [7], [8] and [9] in fact form a natural group. All three passages are built around the key phrase yai pūrvaṃ manuṣyabhūtaiḥ śrutaṃ bhaviṣyati; all three have the same basic sequential construction illustrating the fact that the individual must undergo the fruits of his past actions, but that, having heard the name of Bhaiṣajyaguru, he will at some point achieve a birth that will allow him to avoid an eternal repetition of his 'fate'. It is interesting to note that while jātismara is found only in [7], it has its functional counterparts in each of the other two: in [8] it is the possession of 'the correct view'; in [9] the meeting with the good spiritual friend. All three things represent potentially decisive 'moments' in the individual's progress, and all in virtually the same way: they assure the individual of a means of altering his old behavioral patterns. Implicit here is the fact that these passages are not interested in the non-giving of gifts, failure in morality, pride, etc. in themselves. They are only typical examples of the kinds of failings which may occur that - if I am not mistaken - were taken more or less at random to illustrate the essential point; that is to say, the way in which the vow of Bhaiṣajyaguru was thought to work. And the way in which Bhaiṣajyaguru's vow works, is the way in which the vow of Amitābha and all the others also works.

[9]

Again further, Mañjuśrī, it happens that beings who speak praise of themselves, through envy utter dispraise of others. Those exalters of themselves, beings who disparage others, they will experience suffering for many thousands of years in the three unfortunate rebirths. They, with the lapse of several thousands of years, having passed away from there, are (then) reborn among animals, among oxen and horses and camels and asses, etc. Beaten with blows from whips and goads, their bodies tormented by hunger and thirst, carrying great loads, they will go down the path. If at some time[1] *they will acquire a human birth, they will always be reborn in inferior families; in servitude they will always be subject to the will of others. (But) by which of these, when formerly they were men, the name of that Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabha, the Tathāgata, will*[2] *have been heard, they, through that root of merit, will (eventually) be freed from all suffering; they will come to be possessed of keen faculties, learned, knowledgeable, wise, intent upon searching out the roots of merit. They will always gain a meeting with the good friend. They (then) cut the snares of Māra; they burst the shell of knowledge*[3]*, they cause the river of depravities to dry up; they are freed from birth, old age, dying, sorrow, suffering, despair and anxiety.*

1) T: 'If once in a hundred times'. 2) I have translated as if the text had śrutaṃ bhaviṣyanti; so X and T here, as well as the parallel expression at [7] and [8]. 3) T: 'the shell of ignorance' and this is more in line with what we would expect, but as I have said in the notes to the edition, none of the three Mss. support this. The Mss. could, of course, represent the irregular sandhi of loss of initial a- after final -i, but this is not a typical irregularity of the Gilgit Mss. They often have the expected -y a-, or -i a- with hiatus.

[10]

Again further, Mañjuśrī, it happens that there are beings who, delighting in backbiting, cause mutual conflicts and disagreements and disputes among beings. Those beings, having mutually aggressive thoughts, perform various kinds of unmeritorious action through body, speech (and) mind; desiring one another's disadvantage, they constantly advance for each other's misfortune. They compel the devatā of the forest, the devatā of trees, the devatā of the mountains, to draw near; in the burning-grounds they compel various bhūtas to draw near[1]*. They deprive living things born among animals of life; they perform pūjā to yakṣas and rakṣasas which live on flesh and blood. Having made the name*[2] *or a likeness of the body of their enemy, they then bring into effect terrible spells, desiring to cause by means of (a) kākhorda or vetāḍa an impediment to his life or the destruction of his body. (But) by which of those (so attacked) the name of the Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabha, the Tathāgata, will have been heard, to their (life) it is not possible to create an impediment by any means. They*[3] *dwell mutually with thoughts of friendliness, with thoughts of benefit, with thoughts free of malice, much pleased with each other's assistance.*

1) I have here followed the Tibetan punctuation of the sentence; cf [10] n.15 of the edition. 2) T: 'Calling upon the name of their enemy, or having made a likeness (of him)'. 3) The referent of te (V and X, sarve te) is left somewhat ambigious.

---

a. There are a number of points worth noting here. First, the various devatās mentioned in our passage are well known from early canonical literature (cf. J.Masson, *La religion populaire dans le canon bouddhique pāli* (Louvain: 1942), esp. 136f; in reference to which C.Regamey says: "Une étude analogue mériterait d'être faite également pour la littérature

du Mahāyāna des sept ou huit premiers siècles de notre ère" ("Motifs vichnouites et śivaïtes dans le Kāraṇḍavyūha", *Études tibétaines dédiées à la mémoire de Marcelle Lalou* (Paris: 1917) 415). At Gilgit see *SR* X 79 where reference is made to vanavihareṣu ... devatāś, 'devatās (that reside) in forests and vihāras'; nagaradevatāḥ, 'devatās of the city'; X 80: vanadevatā; śailadevatāś, 'devatā of rocks'; nadīdevatāḥ, 'devatā of the rivers'; X 81: aṭavimaruṣu devatā, 'devatā (residing) in woods and deserts'; giriśikhareṣu devatā, 'devatās (dwelling) on mountain peaks', utsasaratadāgadevatā, 'devatā of springs, pools and tanks'; and *Rkp* 88.2, veṇuvanaparipālikā devatā; 88.12 vihāradevatā; 88.16 oṣadhidevatā; 89.7 vṛkṣadevatā; 89.14, dvārakoṣṭhakadevatā; etc. For bhūta (which Wayman, "The Twenty-One Praises of Tārā, A Syncretism of Śaivism and Buddhism", *Journal of the Bihar Research Society* 45 (1959) 40, translates as "elementary spirits"), Yakṣa (the best overall study of which is still A.K.Coomaraswamy, *Yakṣas*, Parts I & II (Washington: 1928-31) reprinted, New Delhi: 1971) and Rākṣasas we have a number of passages indicating both their character and the means available for coping with them:

Aj 118.1-4: ye bhikṣusaṃghasya dadeya dānaṃ
na tasya yakṣā na ca rākṣasāś ca
na pretakuṣmāṇḍamahoragāś ca
vighnaṃ na kurvanti kadāci teṣāṃ

Who would give gifts to the community of bhikṣus, for them neither yakṣas nor rākṣasas nor pretas, kuṣmāṇḍas, nor mahoragas create an obstacle at any time.

Aj 124.1-2: na cāyaṃ ghātito yakṣair na bhūtair na ca rākṣasaiḥ
bodhisattvo 'py ayaṃ loke jaravyādhipramocakaḥ

And this one is not killed by yakṣas or bhūtas or rākṣasas; indeed, this bodhisattva is in the world one who frees from old age and disease.

Eka 38.2 [Avalokita says:] yat sarvaduṣṭayakṣarākṣasānāṃ anena hṛdayena karṣitvā maitracittā[n] dayācittān kṛtvānuttarāyāṃ samyaksaṃbodhau pratiṣṭhāpayāmi: 'Then having sapped the strength of all malignant yakṣas and rākṣasas through this [*Ekadaśamukha-*]*hṛdaya*, having effected thoughts of friendliness

and thoughts of pity (in them), I will establish them in utmost, right and complete awakening.

Kv 281.18; fol 1603R: [The rākṣasas of Siṃhaladvīpa, after their encounter with Avalokita say] punar api na prāṇātipātaṃ kurvāmaḥ / yādṛśena jāmbudvīpakā manuṣyā jīvanti annena pānena tādṛśajīvikayā vayaṃ jīvāmaḥ / punar api rākṣasīvṛttiṃ na kurvāmaḥ /: 'Moreover, we will not take life. By what kind of food and drink the men of Jambudvīpa live, by that kind of sustenance we will live. Moreover, we will not maintain ourselves as rākṣasas usually do.'

SP 157.2: [The bodhisattva Pradānaśūra says to the Blessed One] ahaṃ api bhagavann evaṃrūpānāṃ dharmabhāṇakānāṃ hetor dhāraṇīpadāni dāsyāmi yas teṣāṃ evaṃrūpānāṃ dharmabhaṇakānāṃ na kaścid avatārapreksy avatāragaveṣy avatāraṃ lapsyate. tadyathā devo vā nāgo yakṣo vā rākṣaso vā pūtano vā kṛtya vā kumbhāṇḍo vā preto vā avatārapreksy avatāragaveṣy avatāraṃ lapsyate: 'I also, O Blessed One, for the sake of such reciters of dharma will give dhāraṇīpadas so that no one watching for, seeking for a chance to do harm to such reciters of dharma will obtain a chance; that is to say, (no) deva, nāga, yakṣa, rākṣasa, etc., watching for, seeking for a chance to do harm will obtain it.' (cf. *SP* 158.7).

StA 55.13: The Blessed One describes some dhāraṇīmantrapada intended for the protection of those who maintain the dharmaparyāya for a long time as: sarvayakṣabhūtamanuṣyavaśaṃkarāṇi, 'the subjugators of all yakṣas, bhūtas and men'; at 57.7 Vajrapāṇi says: tataḥ punaḥ bhagavan nābhijānāmi yasya svapne 'pi sā dhāraṇī karṇapuṭe nipatitāntargatā tasya syāccharīre daurbalyaṃ ... udakaṃ vā śastraṃ vā viṣaṃ vā garaṃ vā ḍākiṇī vā bhūto vā yakṣo vā śatravo vā manuṣyā vāmanuṣyā vā viheṭhaṃ vā kartuṃ hiṃsāṃ vā vidhātuṃ vā nedaṃ sthānaṃ vidyate: 'Then again, O Blessed One, in whose ear that dhāraṇī has fallen or entered, even in a dream, of him I do not know the bodily weakness ... the water or sword or poison or noxious drink or ḍākiṇī or bhūta or yakṣa or enemies or humans or non-humans that would be able to do him injury or effect harm. This situation does not occur.

SR XI 40: bhūtagaṇapiśācarākṣasāś co
parama sudāruṇa ye ca māṃsabhakṣāḥ
te 'sya bhayu na jātu saṃja[nenti
susukhuma dharmasvabhāvu

And which are the most dreadful, flesh-eating troops of bhūtas and piśācas and rākṣasas, they never produce fear in him knowing the very subtle own-being of dharmas.

b. To these passages we might add a few others in which we can focus more specifically on the terms kākhorda and vetāḍa:

GP v 141b.6: punar aparaṃ kauśika sacet sa kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā imāṃ prajñāpāramitām udgrahīṣyati paryavāpsyati dhārayiṣyati ... sarvākārajñatācittena cāvirahito bhaviṣyati tasya kaścid abhaiṣajyam avakiret kākhordaṃ vā kuryat, agni-khadāṃ vopanāmayec chastreṇa vā dadyād viṣeṇa vā dadyād udakena vā cchorayet sarvaṃ tasya na kramiṣyati · tatkasya hetoḥ mahāvidyeyaṃ kauśika yad uta prajñāpāramitā · anuttareyaṃ kauśika vidyā yad uta prajñāpāramitā · niruttareyaṃ kauśika vidyā yad uta prajñāpāramitā · atra ca vidyāyāṃ śikṣamāṇaḥ kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā nātmavyāvādhāya cetayate · na pa[ra]vyā[vā]dhāya cetayate · nobhayavyā[vā]dhāya cetayate ·

Again further, Kauśika, if that son or daughter of good family will take up this Perfection of Wisdom, will study, will preserve it and will not be separated from a thought of the knowledge of all modes, whosoever would sprinkle a drug on him, or would make/perform a *kākhorda*, or would lead him into a pit of fire, or would strike him with a sword, or would present him with poison, or would throw him into the water - none of these will approach him. What is the reason for that? This, Kauśika, is a great spell, that is to say, the Perfection of Wisdom. This Kauśika, is the utmost spell, the highest spell, that is to say, the Perfection of Wisdom. And training here in that spell a son or daughter of good family does not intend an injury to himself, does not intend an injury to others, does not intend an injury to either.

Rkp 168.19: we read that if a certain mantrapada is recited in a town or city, etc., tatra te duṣṭayakṣakaṭapūtanāḥ tāṃ pūrvavairānubaddhāṃ akuśalakarmakṛyāṃ prajahyuḥ / maitrīkaruṇāmṛducitt[ā]ḥ sarvabhūtada[y]āpannāḥ hitacittā bhaveyuḥ / tāṃś ca sarvān rāṣṭrakuṭumbadevanāgayakṣakaṭapūtanasaṃkṣobhāṃ sarvacandrasūryagrahanakṣatradaṇḍaviṣaśastrakākhordasaṃkṣobhāṃ ... praśameyuḥ

... there those malignant yakṣas and kaṭapūtanas would abandon the performance of unmeritorious acts connected to their former animosity; they would come to be possessed of gentle thoughts of friendliness and compassion, arrived at pity towards all creatures, having thoughts of benefit; and all the disturbances from the devas, nāgas, yakṣas, and kaṭapūtanas of the kingdom and household, all disturbances from planets and stars, sun and moon, civil authority, poison, arms and *kākhordas* ... they would allay.

ŚmD 100.9: here we find sarvakṛtyakākhordavināśanī, 'the destroyer of all sorcery/sorceresses and *kākhordas*' as a 'name' of Śrī-mahādevī.

Sgṭ 2122.3 (text cited above p.159): Of those who 'will wholeheartedly reverence the *Saṃghaṭa-sūtra* it is said "not by the sword will he die. Not by poison will he die. And a *kākhorda* will not affect him".

SP (Kern ed.) 450.2:

mantrābalavidya-auṣadhī bhūtavetāla śarīranāśanāḥ
smarato avalokiteśvaraṃ tena gacchanti yataḥ pravartitāḥ /

mantras, powers, spells, and herbs, *vetālas* (through, or:) and bhūtas which destroy the body - from recollecting Avalokiteśvara they go there whence they came.

Kv 263.9: Yama calls Avalokiteśvara yakṣarākṣasabhūtapreta*vetāla*ḍākinīkūṣmāṇḍāpasmārasaṃtrāsanakara.

Bbp 193-5-7: another of the eight benefits of worshipping, copying, etc., the text is: gaṅ dag gšed byed daṅ / byad daṅ / sṅags daṅ / ro laṅs gžan gyi gnod pa de dag de'i lus la gnod par mi 'gyur ba daṅ /: 'which are the sorceries (kṛtya), the *kākhordas*, the mantras, the *vetāḍas* which harm others, they will not harm his body'.

Finally we have another passage from *Bhg* itself:

Bhg [20]: "The eighth untimely death is: those who die through the employment of poison, kākhordas and vetāḍas.

Neither vetāla/vetāḍa nor kākhorda admits of a very precise definition. Ruegg (review of Macdonald, *Matériaux pour l'étude de la littérature populaire tibétaine*, I, *IIJ* 14 (1972) 137) says: "The Sanskrit word *vetāla*, which is often translated 'vampire', designates here more precisely a resurrected corpse or 'zombie', the Tibetan equivalent *ro laṅs* meaning literally 'risen corpse'." But he adds in a note: "It may be noted that elsewhere, both in non-Buddhist usage ... and in Buddhist usage ... the term *vetāla* refers to the revivifying of a corpse, for example by introducing into it a *piśāca*" (cf. M.Mayrhofer, *Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*, Bd III (Heidelberg: 1976) 255). That is to say, the term can be the name of either a 'thing' resulting from a 'magical' procedure, or the procedure itself. I have already indicated that I think something similar is true for kākhorda (G.Schopen, Review of Conze, *The Large Sutra on Perfect Wisdom*, *IIJ* 19 (1977) 141). Most recently, Mayrhofer (*Kurzgefasstes*, Bd III 670) defines kākhorda as "Zauberer, Hexenmeister / sorcerer" (see also the literature he cites which appears to confirm that it is an Iranian loanword). But this definition does not seem to fit well with *GP* v 1406.6, *Bhg* [10], and *Bhg* [20] where a kākhorda is something 'made' or 'performed' or 'used'. Here it would seem to be the name for a certain kind of evil charm or malediction, or a procedure involving the use of such a charm. This might also be the case - judging by the other items enumerated along with it - at *SP* 450.2, especially if we take bhūtavetāla as meaning 'the revivifying of corpses (vetāla) by means of bhūtas'; and it would also work well for *Rkp* 168.19 and *Sgṭ* 2122.3, where the term occurs in close conjunction with 'things', i.e. poison, swords, etc., and at

ŚmD 100.9, if kṛtya means here 'sorcery', and with the same condition at *Bbp* 193-5-7. The Tibetan translation of kākhorda is in this respect particularly interesting. It generally renders the term by byad or byad stems. Jäschke (*A Tibetan-English Dictionary* (London: 1881, 1968) 375) under byad gives: 1. *"enemy"*; 2. *"a wicked demon"*; 3. "also byad stem(s) ... *imprecation, malediction,* combined with sorcery, the name of an enemy being written on a slip of paper and hid in the ground, under various conjurations"; (*dge bšes chos kyi grags pas brtsoms pa'i: brda dag miṅ tshig gsal ba bžugs so* (Peking: 1957) 570: byad stems / dmod pa mthu rgyab nas gnod soṅ zer.). As I have already said in *IIJ* 19, Jäschke's third meaning could almost be a loose paraphrase of *Bhg* [10].

Admitting from the outset that the evidence is not conclusive either way, I would tentatively conclude from the above that in the majority of cases kākhorda probably refers to a particular kind of spell, charm, or malediction, or to the procedure in which such a spell is utilized; and secondarily to the 'thing', 'power', or 'creature' which is produced by that spell or procedure. It will, of course, be obvious that in the passages translated above I have either hedged my bets, or translated with this 'conclusion' already in mind.

c. In addition to the passages which present the general character of yakṣas, rākṣasas, etc., there is another group which is of interest because it deals with one of their more specific activities, and because this particular activity is referred to on three separate occasions in *Bhg*. At *Bhg* [15] it is said that if an expectant mother performs a particular pūjā to Bhaiṣajyaguru, she will give birth to a son 'having all his limbs fully formed, handsome, beautiful, etc.'; and that "It will not be possible for his vital warmth to be snatched away by non-human beings (na tasya śakyam amānuṣena ojo grahītum)"; at [13], of those who preserve the sūtra, the name, etc., of Bhaiṣajyaguru: "not for them will there be an untimely death, and it is not possible for their vital warmth to be stolen away by any means; or else, their vital warmth being stolen, they again recover it (... na ca kenacic chakyam ojopahartuṃ, hṛtaṃ vā ojaḥ punaḥ pratyāharanti)"; and at [20]: "The third untimely death is: those who are excessively careless, dwelling in carelessness, non-human beings steal away their vital warmth (... teṣām amānuṣā ojam apaharanti)".

Bbp 193-5-6: Yet another of the eight benefits of worshipping, copying, etc., the text is: gaṅ 'jig rten na gnod sbyin daṅ / 'byuṅ po daṅ / śa za mdaṅs 'phrog pa de dag thams cad byams pa la gnas par 'gyur ba daṅ /: 'which in the world are the yakṣas and bhūtas and piśācas that steal away vital warmth, they all will come to dwell in friendliness (towards him)'.

SP (Kern ed.) 450.5:

saci ojaharaiḥ parīvṛto yakṣanāgāsurabhūtarākṣasaiḥ
smarato avalokiteśvaraṃ romakūpaṃ na prabhonti hiṃsitum //

'If (he) is surrounded by the yakṣas, nāgas, asuras, bhūtas and rākṣasas which carry off (one's) vital warmth, from recollecting Avalokiteśvara they are not able to harm a hair (on his head)'.

Rkp 140.1: The Mahābrahmā Bhūteśvara asks the Buddha's sanction: yad aham etarhi dharmabhāṇakānān dhārmaśravaṇikānāṃ cārthe tādṛśī[m] maṃtrapadarakṣāṃ bhāṣeta / yathā yaḥ kaścit paścime kāle māro vā māraparṣad vā devo vā nāgo vā nāgī vā ... yāvat piśāco vā piśācī vā ... manuṣyo vā amanuṣyo vā dharmabhāṇakānāṃ dhārmaśravaṇikānāṃ vā avatārapreksī avatāragaveṣī pratyarthikaḥ pratyamitro vā upasaṃkrametāṃtaśo dharmabhāṇakānāṃ dhārmaśravaṇikānāṃ vā ekaromakūpam api viheṭhayed vihiṃsayed vipralopayed ojo vāharec chvāsaṃ vā kāye prakṣipe[d] duṣṭacitto vā prekṣetāntaśaḥ ekakṣaṇam api teṣām ahaṃ māraṇāṃ yāvan manuṣyāmanuṣyāṇāṃ pratiṣedhaṃ daṇḍaparigrahaṃ vā kuryāṃ jambhanaṃ mohanaṃ śapathaṃ dadyā[m]/.

So that I now may declare such protection through mantrapadas for the sake of the reciters of dharma and the hearers of dharma in order that, in the last time, whatsoever māra or assembly of māra or deva or nāga or nāgī ... up to: (whatsoever) piśāca or piśācī or human or non-human being, watching for, seeking for a chance to do harm, an enemy, an opponent, would approach those reciters of dharma (and) hearers of dharma, would hurt, harm, or injure even as little as a single hair (on the head) of those reciters and hearers of dharmas, or would carry off their vital warmth, or would project their breath into their body (lus la dbugs chen po gtoṅ ṅam), or would look at them with a malignant thought for even a single moment,

I would repulse or punish and contain those māras, up to: those human and non-human beings, I would crush, confuse and curse them. (cf. *Rkp* 144.8f; 166.18f).

GP (Kimura ed., II-3) 239.14: evam eva kauśika tasya kulaputrasya vā kuladuhitur vā na balavaty āhāre gṛddhir bhaviṣyati. tat kasya hetos. tathā hi tasyāmanuṣyā ojaḥ kāya upasaṃharanti. ye cāpi daśasu dikṣu buddhā bhagavantas te 'pi sadevanāgayakṣagandharvāsuragaruḍakiṃnaramahoragāḥ ojaḥ kāye prakṣipanti. imaṃ sa kauśika kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā dṛṣṭadhārmikaṃ guṇaṃ parigṛhṇīte ye imāṃ prajñāpāramitām udgṛhṇīte paryavāpnoti dhārayati vācayati yoniśaś ca manasikaroti avirahitaś ca sarvajñatācittena.

Just so, Kauśika, of that son or daughter of good family there will not be a strong desire for food. What is the reason for that ? For just as non-human beings carry away the vital warmth in his body, which are the Buddhas, the Blessed Ones in the ten directions, they together with the devas, nāgas, yakṣas, gandharvas, asuras, garuḍas, kiṃnaras and mahoragas project vital warmth into his body. Kauśika, that son or daughter of good family gains this quality here-and-now who takes up this Perfection of Wisdom, studies, preserves, etc., it, and who is not separated from the thought of all knowledge.

[For the word ojas see J. Filliozat, *Étude de démonologie indienne* (Paris: 1937) 29, n.2; J.Gonda, *Ancient-Indian ojas, Latin *augos and the Indo-European Nouns in -es/-os* (Utrecht: 1952); R.F.G.Müller, "Wörterheft zu einigen Ausdrücken indischer Medizin", *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung* 8 (1961) 88.]

d. The picture which all of the above passages present is, however, only half of the total picture. For, although our reader at Gilgit would have been very familiar with devatās, yakṣas, rākṣasas, etc., and would have been well aware of their malignant nature and potential threat, he would also have known them in a different role. This is clear from two further passages in *Bhg*.

Bhg [21]: Here the twelve great yakṣa generals, each surrounded by thousands of yakṣas, say: "Through the power of the

Buddha the name of the Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabha, the Tathāgata, was heard by us; for us there is no longer the fear of an unfortunate destiny. We all together, for as long as we live, go to the Buddha for refuge, we go to the Dharma for refuge, we go to the Saṃgha for refuge; we will be zealous for the benefit, advantage and ease of all beings. Especially the village or city or district or forest dwelling where this sūtra will circulate; or he who will preserve the name of the Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguru-vaiḍūryaprabha, the Tathāgata; we will indeed protect those; we will free them from all misfortune; we will fulfil all their hopes".

Bhg [13]: "The Four Great Kings together with their retinues, and koṭis of hundreds of thousands of other devatās will approach there where this sūtra will circulate".

Of the many similar passages from other texts at Gilgit we might note the following:

SP 157.26: atha khalu lambā ca nāma rākṣasī. vilambā ca nāma rakṣasī. kuṭadantī ca nāma rākṣasī. puṣpadantī ca nāma rākṣasī ... sarvasattvaujahāriṇī ca nāma rākṣasī. hārītī ca saputraparivārā. etāḥ sarvā rākṣasyo yena bhagavāṃs tenopasaṃ-krāmann upasaṃkramya sarvās tā rākṣasya ekasvareṇa bhagavantam etad avocat: vayam api bhagavaṃs teṣām evaṃrūpāṇāṃ sūtrānta-dhārakānāṃ dharmabhāṇakānāṃ rakṣāvaraṇaguptiṃ kariṣyāmaḥ svastyayanaṃ ca kariṣyāmo [yathā] t[e]ṣāṃ dharmabhāṇakānāṃ na kaśc[id a]vatārāprekṣy a[vatāra]gaveṣy avatāraṃ lapsyatīti ... yakṣo vā rākṣaso vā preto vā piśāco vā pūtano vā kṛtyā vā vetāḍo vā, etc.

Then further the rākṣasīs named Lambā, Vilambā, Kuṭadantī, Puṣpadantī, ... and the rākṣasī named Sarvasattvaujahāriṇī (N.B. 'The Stealer of the Vital Warmth of All Beings'), and Hārītī surrounded by her sons - all these rākṣasīs approached there where the Blessed One was; having approached, all those rākṣasīs said this with a single voice to the Blessed One: 'We also, O Blessed One, will guard, protect and shelter such preservers of the sūtras and reciters of dharma, and we will effect their success in such a way that no one watching for, seeking for a

chance to do harm to those reciters of dharma will obtain a chance ... neither yakṣa, rākṣasa, preta, piśāca, pūtana, kṛtyā, nor vetāḍa, etc. [In the course of this declaration the rākṣasīs give dhāraṇī-padas for the stated purposes to the Buddha].

StA 71.1: atha khalv anopamā mahāyakṣiṇī yena bhagavāṃs tenopasamakrāmat. bhagavantaṃ nānāpuṣpaduṣyayugair ācchādya bhagavataḥ pādayor nipatya bhagavantam etad avocat. evaṃ smarāmy ahaṃ bhagavan mayā bhagavataḥ kauśāmbyāṃ ghoṣilasyārāme viharataḥ purataḥ pratijñā samudāhṛtā sarvasattvānām arthāya. aham api bhagavan sarvavidyādharāṇāṃ hṛdayaṃ jānāmi. tan me bhagavān anujānātu bahujanahitāya bahujanasukhāya sarvāśāparipūraṇārthāya bhikṣubhikṣuṇyupāsakopāsikānāṃ ca.

Then further the Mahāyakṣiṇī Anopamā approached there where the Blessed One was. Having covered the Blessed One with various flowers and double lengths of fine cloth, having fallen at the feet of the Blessed One, she said this to him: 'I, O Blessed One, remember thus: by me in the presence of the Blessed One when he was dwelling in Kauśāmbī, in the ārama of Ghoṣila, a promise was declared for the benefit of all beings. I know the 'heart' of all 'magicians'. May the Blessed One consent to (my giving) that for the benefit and ease of many men, and for the sake of fulfilling all the hopes of the monks, nuns, lay men and women! [Then follows the Hṛdaya].

[On vidyādhara, 'magician', an old Buddhist term and functionary, see H. Lüders, "Die Vidyādharas in der buddhistischen Literatur und Kunst", *Kleine Schriften* (Wiesbaden: 1973) 104-19].

GP v 142a.3; Kimura ed., II-2 504.7: punar aparaṃ kauśika yatreyam prajñāpāramitā likhitvā dhārayiṣyati nodgrahīṣyate · na svādhyāyayiṣyate · na bhāvayiṣyate na paryavāpsyate na yoniśo manasikariṣyati · na punas tatra gṛhe vā grāme vā nagare vā manuṣyo vāmanuṣyo vāvatārāprekṣy avatāraṃ lapsyante · tatkasya heto · tathā hy atra prajñāpāramitāyāṃ [Nepalese ed. inserts here: pūjā 'rthāya] ye trisāhasramahāsāhasre lokadhātau cāturmahārāja-kāyikā devaputrā yāvat aghaniṣṭhadevaputrā ye py aprameyāsaṃ-khyeyeṣu lokadhātu(ṣu) cāturmahārājakā devaputrā yāvad a[gha]niṣṭhā-

devaputrās te teṣāṃ kulaputrāṇāṃ kuladuhitṝṇāṃ ca rakṣāvaraṇa-guptiṃ[m] saṃvidhāsyanti · te ca devaputrā āgatyemāṃ prajñāpāramitāṃ satkṛtya gurukṛtya mānayitvā pūjayitvāgamiṣyanti [Nepalese: pratigamiṣyanti] · ya imāṃ prajñāpāramitāṃ likhitvā dhārayiṣyati · tasyeme dṛṣṭadhārmikā guṇānuśaṃsā bhaviṣyanti.

Again further, Kauśika, where one, after having written down this Perfection of Wisdom, will preserve it, (even though) he will not take it up, nor study it, nor develop it, nor pursue it, nor fix it well in his mind, there in that house or village or city a human or non-human being watching for a chance to do harm will not obtain a chance. What is the reason for that ? Just here near the Perfection of Wisdom the Cāturmahārājakāyika devaputras, up to: Aghaniṣṭhadevaputras in the three-thousand-great-thousand world-sphere, as well as in immeasurable and incalculable other world-spheres, they will look after the guarding, protection and shelter of those sons and daughters of good family. And those devaputras having come there, having honored, revered, paid homage to and worshipped this Perfection of Wisdom, will come again. These are the qualities and blessings here-and-now for him who, after having written down this Perfection of Wisdom, will preserve it.

An even more elaborate version of this kind of passage is found a little later at *GP* (Kimura ed. II-3) 243.26f. Two of the elaborations found there are worth noting. At 242.25 it is said that the devas from the various world-spheres will come and 'look after the guarding, protection and shelter of the individual' so that nāpy asya kaścid avatāraprekṣī avatāragaveṣī avatāraṃ lapsyate sthāpayitvā pūrvakarma-vipākaṃ: 'no one watching for, seeking for a chance to harm him will obtain a chance, except as a result of the maturation of the individual's past action' (cf. above p.182). And at 241.4 Śakra, after being told that the devas will come to that spot, says to the Buddha: kathaṃ bhagavan kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā jñāsyati iha cāturmahārājakāyikā devaputrā āgacchanti yāvad akaniṣṭhā devaputrā agacchantīti ... imāṃ prajñāpāramitāṃ udgrahītuṃ vā ... pūjayituṃ vā ... [and the Buddha replies:] sacet kauśika kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā udāram avabhāsaṃ jñāsyanti ... amānuṣaṃ divyaṃ gandham anāghrātapūrvam āghrāsyati niṣṭhā tena gantavyā mahaujaskā mahaujaskā iha devaputrā āgatā iti prajñā-

pāramitāṃ vācayituṃ ... pūjayituṃ ... yāś ca tatra pṛthivīpradeśe 'lpaujaskā alpaujaskā devatā bhaviṣyanti tās tato 'pakramitavyaṃ maṅsyante, teṣāṃ mahaujaskānāṃ mahaujaskānāṃ devānāṃ tejaś ca śriyaś cāsahamānāḥ. yathā yathā mahaujaskā mahaujaskā devatā upasaṃkramiṣyanti tathā tathā te kulaputrāḥ kuladuhitaro vā udārādhimuktikā bhaviṣyanti: 'How, O Blessed One, will a son or daughter of good family know 'The Cāturmahārājakāyika devaputras have come here, up to: the Akaniṣṭha devaputras have come here ... to take up this Perfection of Wisdom ... or to worship it ?' ... [The Buddha replies:] 'If, Kauśika, a son or daughter of good family shall become aware of a great radiance ... (if) he shall smell a non-human, heavenly perfume not smelled before, he should come to this conclusion: 'devatās having very great vital warmth have come here to recite ... to worship the Perfection of Wisdom'... And which on that spot of earth are the devatās having only very little vital warmth, they think it best to retreat from there, being unable to endure the splendor and radiance of those devatās with very great vital warmth. And the more those devatās having very great vital warmth will approach, the more those sons and daughters of good family will come to be such as have a great resolve.

In addition to longer passages of this kind we might also note: *SR* 334.4, XXVIII 2,4, where one of the ten 'blessings' of a bodhisattva who is established in patience (kṣānti) and dwells in friendliness is that devas, nāgas and yakṣas protect him; *SR* 335.15, XXVIII 7, 13, where one of the ten 'blessings' of a bodhisattva who has undertaken vigor (ārabdhavīryasya) is that he is taken care of by the devatās (devatāparigṛhīta); virtually the same thing is said of one who preserves the *Samādhi-(rāja-sūtra)* at *SR* XXVIII 84, and at XXX 8 he who preserves *SR* is said to be protected and attended by devas, nāgas, asuras and yakṣas; at *StA* 53.16 he who worships, preserves, etc., the text is said to be protected by devas; at *ŚmD* 94.15 it is said of one who will preserve the stotra named The One Hundred and Eight Pure Praises of Śrī-mahādevī' (śriyā mahādevyā aṣṭottaraṃ śataṃ vimalaprakhyaṃ nāma stotraṃ) that tasya ca rājñaḥ kṣatriyasya gṛhe śrīr nivasiṣyati: 'Śrī will dwell in the house of that kṣatriya king'; at *Kv* 299.1 it is said of a dharma-reciter who preserves the ṣaḍakṣari: upasaṃkrāmanti brahmāviṣṇumaheśvara-candrādityavāyuvaruṇāgnayo yamaś ca dharmarājo 'nye ca catvāro mahārājānaḥ; see also *SP* 140.32f; *SP* (Kern ed.) 288.11; etc. etc.

e. I have cited these passages at such length for a number of reasons. First because they are in our modern sources usually ignored or passed over in a line or two. There is, I think, a very real reluctance on the part of Western scholars to admit that the people who read or wrote texts such as *GP* or *SR actually* believed in yakṣas and rākṣasas who stole away one's vital warmth; and yet those same texts continually show this cultural myopia for what it is. Second, such passages are a prominent part of *Bhg* (involving [10], [13], [15], [20], and [21]) and the Buddhism of Gilgit as a whole. Third, by looking at a sufficiently large sample of such passages some very interesting patterns begin to emerge. We might here collect and expand some of the points which are suggested by an analysis of the above material.

1) The literature available to an individual at Gilgit is saturated with references to devatās, nāgas, yakṣas, rākṣasas, etc. Both the number and nature of these references indicate that fear, especially fear of death as personified in these 'beings', was a prominent, if not pathological component in the Buddhism available at Gilgit.

2) These *beings* were either a direct threat to the individual, or offered protection from a threat. Again, in either case their presence indicates a predominantly fearful attitude towards one's environment.

3) The magnitude of the threat and the pervasiveness of the fear are indicated by the multiplicity of means intended to cope with them.

4) For protection *from* devatās, yakṣas, kākhordas and vetāḍas - whether these last were kinds of charms or magical procedures, or the 'thing' produced by these procedures - the individual could have recourse to the giving of gifts to the Saṃgha (*Aj* 118.1-4), hearing the name of Bhaiṣajyaguru (*Bhg* [10], [20]), 'recollecting' Avalokita (*SP* (Kern) 450.2, *Kv* 263.9), or Śrī-mahādevī (*ŚmD* 100.9), worshipping copying, preserving, or studying a dharmaparyāya (*Sgt* 2122.3, *Bbp* 193-5-7, *GP* v 140b.6) or reciting or hearing a dhāraṇī or mantrapadas (*Eka* 38.2, *SP* 157.2, *StA* 55.13, 57.7, *Rkp* 168.19), or finally, understanding the own-being of dharmas (*SR* XI 40).

5) While our texts are very often content to simply indicate that such 'beings' were a constant threat to the individual's life, in a number of cases one particular form in which this threat was realized

is singled out. This is the theft of one's vital warmth by devas, yakṣas, etc. Here again the individual had recourse to a number of means to prevent such a theft: he could direct pūjā towards Bhaiṣajyaguru (*Bhg* [15]) or preserve his name (*Bhg* [13]); he could worship, preserve, or study a text (*Bhg* [131], *Bbp* 193-5-6, *GP* (Kimura) 239.14); he could 'recollect' Avalokita (*SP* (Kern) 430.5) or he could recite a dhāraṇī (*Rkp* 140.1).

6) But if the individual required protection *from* such 'beings', he was also able to acquire protection *by or through* such 'beings'. In a number of cases we even have yakṣas and rākṣasas protecting the individual from other yakṣas and rākṣasas (*SP* 157.26, *StA* 71.1). Once again the individual could obtain the protection of these beings in a number of ways: he could preserve or worship a text (*Bhg* [13], [21], *GP* v 142a3, *GP* (Kimura) 243.26f, *SR* XXVIII 84, XXX 8, *StA* 53.16, *ŚmD* 94.15, *SP* 140.32); he could recite or preserve a dhāraṇī (*SP* 157.26, *StA* 71.1, *Kv* 299.1); or he could practice patience, friendliness and vigor (*SR* 334.4, 335.15).

f. 7) This multiplicity of the means intended to cope with these 'beings' is yet another example of what I have called the process of generalization. Expressed differently, we can say that these 'means' or activities are *functionally* interchangeable, or *functionally* equivalent. This in turn has important implications for at least one of these activities: the recitation of dhāraṇīs (under which term I lump mantras, mantrapadas, vidyās, etc.). It is clear from our passages that the recitation of dhāraṇīs here belongs to the same category of religious activity as do the giving of alms to the monks, reciting, copying, worshipping texts, preserving the name of Bhaiṣajyaguru, etc. It differs neither in kind nor quality. All these activities are public, open to all, require no initiation or guru and are concerned with karmatic goals. They all - including in every way the recitation of dhāraṇīs - are *non-tantric*, if by *tantric* we mean that system which is secret, esoteric, requiring both complex initiations and the presence of the Guru, and whose immediate goal is bodhi. And these, I think, are the essential definitional characteristics of what can be legitimately called Buddhist Tantrism. Because of its accidental importance for *Bhg*, and because of its real importance for the characterization of Gilgit Buddhism as a whole, we must expand a little on this point.

Bhg [10] has given rise to an unfortunate characterization of the text as a whole. Dutt summarizes [10] in the following terms: "There are also some who slander others (paiśūnyābhirata) and instigate people to quarrel among themselves, or kill animals, or practise dreadful (Tantric) practices (ghoravidyām) and so forth;..." (GMs i 55). This becomes, a few years later: "It [*Bhg*] seems to be one of the late sūtras, the subject of which gradually shifted from philosophical matters to worldly things such as evil doers and protection from them. We find here [the] beginnings of later Tāntric sūtras." P.L.Vaidya, *Mahāyāna-Sūtra-Saṁghraha*, Part I (Darbhanga: 1961) xiv). A few years later still we find: "This text [*Bhg*] shows [the] unmistakable influence of Tāntrikism. It refers to dreadful Tāntrika practices, and spells, and includes Rākṣasas among deities that were worshipped; those who eat flesh and blood, frequent cemetery and perform sādhanas, ghora vidyās, are also described." (L.Joshi, *Studies in the Buddhistic Culture of India* (New Delhi: 1967) 319.) The kindest thing that can be said of this series of observations is that it probably results from an unduly sloppy use of the term tantric. Fortunately, a more recent characterization is more accurate. Wayman (*Kailash* 1 (1973) 157) says: "For example, the scripture which Liebenthal translated from Hsuan-tsang's Chinese rendition under the title, *The Sutra of the Lord of Healing* (Peiping, 1936), is simply Mahāyāna Buddhism with no admixture of tantric elements, such as incantations." Wayman was apparently unaware of the Sanskrit text of *Bhg* first published in 1936, and there is in fact a dhāraṇī in at least some editions of Hsüan-tsang's text (see *Buddhist Text Information*, No.12 (1977) 11), but in spite of this his characterization is, as I have said, more accurate. I would question it on only one point. He clearly implies that the presence of "incantations" (by which I assume he means dhāraṇīs, mantrapadas, etc.) is a definitional characteristic of that which is 'tantric'. But that this is not the case is gradually being recognized. Already many years ago Waley pointed out that "Just as European writers have tended to connect the practice of Dhyāna solely with the establishment of a separate Dhyāna sect, so they have also tended to connect the use of dhāraṇī (magic word-formulae) only with the esoteric doctrines of the Vairocana sect [n.2: I give this name to what in Japan is called 'Shingon' and in India 'the Vajrayāna'], which did not become established in China until so late a date as the

eighth century. In fact, however, scriptures centering round the use of spells figure very largely in the lists of works translated in Chinese even as early as the second century A.D.... Out of this literature grew what we may call Dhāraṇī Buddhism ... The Buddhism of Tun-huang, then, as reflected in its paintings and manuscripts is compounded of these two elements (1) the cult of the Paradises, (2) the dhāraṇī cults."(A.Waley, *A Catalogue of Paintings Recovered from Tun-Huang by Sir Aurel Stein* (London: 1931) xiii-xiv). More recently Williams has said: "Similar to the *Suvarṇaprabhāsottama* in its mixed doctrine is the *Inquiry of Vimalaprabha*... This work also contains an unusually large number of dhāraṇīs, designed to avert disasters such as those narrated in the *sūtra*. The Buddhism of these scriptures which were particularly current in Khotan, can be described as a kind of proto-*tantra*. This transitional phase of doctrine in the 8th century seems not yet to have evolved into Tantra as it is known in Japan and later Tibet but differs from simple Mahāyāna" (J.Williams, "The Iconography of Khotanese Painting", *East and West* 23 (1973) 115). Both Waley and Williams, as I read them, want to distinguish between a Buddhism which knows and uses dhāraṇīs, and Tantric Buddhism as such. This, of course, agrees in large part with what I have given above as the situation at Gilgit. I would only add that both Waley and Williams give too great an emphasis to the dhāraṇī by itself and thus fail to take into account the fact that it is, as we have seen, only one of several functionally interchangeable 'devices' available to the individual, and is therefore only one part of a larger whole. And this whole, if I am not mistaken, is what I have called karmatic Buddhism. For in the same way that the practice of 'medicine', the concern for a favorable rebirth, the fear of death, poverty, etc., are fully integrated parts of karmatic Buddhism, so too is *this use* of dhāraṇīs. This is perhaps further confirmed by the fact that a number of the texts found at Gilgit which are easily classed as karmatic are of the same kind - in whole or part - as those mentioned by Waley and Williams (e.g. the *Suvarṇaprabhāsottama*). This is true of *StA*, *Eka*, *ŚmD*, *Kv*, *Rkp*, etc. It should also be added here that but for what is undoubtedly a major weakness in my 'survey' of the Buddhism of Gilgit, such texts would be seen to have had an even more prominent place there. For example, there are four Mss of the *Mahāpratisarāvidyārājñī* in the Gilgit collection (GBMs vi, nos. 6,14,15 and 19; formerly given the title *Mahāvidyārāja-hṛdaya*, *-dhāraṇī*, etc.); at least one Ms. of the

Mahāmāyūrī (M.S.Kaul Shastri, "Report on the Gilgit Excavation in 1938", *Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society* 30 (1939) 11-12, pl.1443; N.P. Chakravarti, "Hatun Rock Inscription of Patoladeva", *Epigraphia Indica* 30 (1953-54) 228-29. The whereabouts of this, and a few other Mss. from Gilgit remains a mystery; cf. R.A.Gunatilaka, "A Short Introduction to the Four Incomplete Manuscripts of the 'Saṃghāṭa-sūtra' kept in the National Archives, New Delhi", *Studies in Indo-Asian Art and Culture* I (New Delhi: 1972) 75-76. Since one of these missing Mss. is a Ms. of the *Saṃghāṭa-sūtra,* a recent article which I have not been able to see, might clear up part of the mystery: O.von Hinüber, "The Gilgit Samghata-sutra in the S.P.S.Museum, Srinagar", *Jammu and Kashmir State Research Biannual* II No.2 (1976) 40-42. A new edition of the *Mahāmāyūrī* based on four Nepalese Mss. belonging to the University of Tokyo has recently been published in Japan: S.Takubo, *Ārya-Mahā-Māyūrī Vidyā-Rājñī* (Tokyo: 1972).); one Ms. of the *Hayagrīvavidyā* (GMs i 43-46); etc. I have for various reasons included none of these in my 'survey'.

Out of all this at least two important 'conclusions' emerge, one important for the characterization of Gilgit Buddhism, the other of potentially wider significance. The first is that although dhāraṇīs are a significant presence in the Buddhism of Gilgit, there is probably nothing which could be called 'tantric', if we mean by 'tantric' 'that system which is secret, esoteric, requiring both complex initiations and the presence of the Guru, and whose immediate goal is bodhi'. The second is that it *appears* that the 'Buddhisms' of Gilgit, Tun-huang and Khotan exhibited roughly the same configuration of elements at roughly the same time (say from the 5th to the 8th centuries). This suggests at least the possibility of establishing a definite periodization in the history of Mahāyāna. This in turn could have important consequences for the study of early Tibetan Buddhism given the known contact during this period between Tibet, Gilgit, Khotan and Tun-huang (a re-assessment of this period in the history of Tibetan Buddhism has already been initiated in an interesting article by P.Kvaerne, "Aspects of the Origin of the Buddhist Tradition in Tibet", *Numen* 19 (1972) 22-40).

This having been something of a digression we must now return to our summary of the points suggested by *Bhg* [10] and similar passages.

8) In a number of the passages I have cited concerning the means available for protection against yakṣas, rākṣasas, etc., it is stated

that the primary effect of reciting the dhāraṇī, worshipping the text, etc., is that it produces thoughts of friendliness, pity, helpfulness, in the yakṣa or rākṣasa or 'being' who is threatening the individual. This is the case in *Eka* 38.2, *Rkp* 168.19, *Bbp* 193-3-6, *StA* 50.3, and, in light of these, probably *Bhg* [10]. And this pattern is an old one, found already in some of the early parittas (cf. C.A.F.Rhys Davids' introduction to the translation of the *Āṭānāṭiya-suttanta*, T.W. and C.A.F.Rhys Davids, *Dialogues of the Buddha*, Part III (Oxford: 1921) 184-87; E. Waldschmidt, *Das Upasenasūtra, ein Zauber gegen Schlangenbiss aus dem Saṃyuktāgama, Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Phil.-hist.Klasse*, Nr. 2, 1957, 27-44). It is interesting to note in light of our discussion under (7) that probably no one would be willing to describe either the *Āṭānāṭiya-suttanta* or the *Upasenasūtra* as 'tantric', and yet they are in fundamentals in no way different from texts like *Ṛka* or *ŚmD*. All these texts clearly belong to the same genre.

9) As I have said above, there appears to be a reluctance on the part of many modern interpreters of Buddhism to admit that the readers and writers of texts like *SR* and *GP* actually believed in and were fearful of yakṣas and rākṣasas, and yet we find at *GP* (Kimura) 239.14 and *GP* v 140b.6 the assurance given that if one takes up, studies, fixes one's mind on - not, be it noted, if one copies, worships, etc. - the Perfection of Wisdom, then he will retain his vital warmth, and will be protected from fire, swords, poison, kākhordas, etc. And at *SR* 334.4, 335.15, and XI 40 that if one is established in patience, understands the own-being of dharmas, etc., he will be protected from and not be frightened by flesh-eating rākṣasas, etc. And such passages could easily be multiplied. I think, therefore, that it is impossible to deny that such concerns were an integral part of the Buddhist experience *at all levels*, and that if we ignore this dimension we produce a picture of Buddhism which is only a caricature of our own provincial outlook.

10) The final point to be noted here is perhaps an obvious one. The transition from *Bhg* [7], [8], and [9] to *Bhg* [10] may at first sight appear to be rather abrupt; it may appear that we have moved from one topic to another of quite different character. But if, as I have already suggested, the ultimate concern of our text - and by extension of karmatic Buddhism as a whole - is death and the fear of death, this transition is perfectly natural. Since death confronts the individual as either

potentially imminent although temporarily avoidable, or as unavoidably present, the response to the fear of death must necessarily come in two forms: it must assure the individual that that potential imminence will not be immediately realized; or it must assure the individual that if death is unavoidably present, its consequence (i.e. rebirth) will be favorable. *Bhg* [7], [8], and [9] are examples of the second form in which the response occurs, while *Bhg* [10] is an example of the first. Virtually all our karmatic texts, like *Bhg*, continually modulate their basic response from one form to another and back again.

[11]

Again further, these four assemblies - monks, nuns, lay men and women - and which[1] believing sons or daughters of good family fast the fast possessed of eight limbs, for one year or three months[2] uphold the foundation of training, whose intention, whose vow is thus: 'May we through this root of merit, in the western direction, in the world-sphere Sukhāvatī, be reborn where the Tathāgata Amitāyus[3] is' - by which of these the name of the Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabha, the Tathāgata, will have been heard, to them at the moment of death, eight bodhisattvas, having come through magic power, will make visible the way; they, miraculously born, will appear there [in Sukhāvatī] in many colored lotuses. Some will also be reborn in the world of devas; of those reborn there that former root of merit is (still) not exhausted and there will be no undergoing of an unfortunate destiny[4]. They, having passed away from there, will come to be kings here in the world of men, lords of the four continents, wheel-turners, and they will establish several koṭīs of niyutas of hundreds of thousands of beings in the ten meritorious paths of action. Others again will be reborn in the houses of great kṣatriya families, of great householder families, of great brāhmaṇa families, in families having abundant wealth and grain and treasuries and stores and prosperity. They will come to be accomplished in form, accomplished in lordship, accomplished in followers, champions, heroes, possessing the force and power of great athletes.

1) V, X, Śikṣ and T: 'and which other'. 2) Śikṣ: 'or three years'. 3) Śikṣ: Amitābha. 4) Śikṣ: 'and there will be no fear of an unfortunate destiny or downfall'.

a. The first thing to be noted here is that for reasons which have more to do with the history of Buddhist Studies than with the history of Buddhism, there is a persistent tendency to associate a figure like that of Bhaiṣajyaguru exclusively with 'lay Buddhism', as opposed to 'monastic Buddhism'. Our text, however, makes it clear that such an association can in no way be maintained. Two of the situations outlined in the text in which the power of the vow of Bhaiṣajyaguru is potentially active - [11] and [15] - are explicitly and unmistakably those of monastic members of the Buddhist community; and a third, [8], is almost certainly also concerned primarily with monks and nuns. This in itself is enough to indicate that if there was a cult of Bhaiṣajyaguru, it was as much a 'monastic' cult as it was a 'lay' cult. And this same pattern is found again and again throughout our texts. It can be seen, for example - and I will restrict myself to passages already cited - at *Bbp* 193-5-4 (see above p.220) where the eight 'blessings' from preserving, worshipping, etc. the text are said to be for 'sons or daughters of good family, kings, ministers, monks, nuns, lay men and women'; at *Rkp* 137.5 (see above p.218) where the ritualized recitation of a dhāraṇī for protection from various disease is to be undertaken by a 'son or daughter of good family, or a bhikṣu or bhikṣuṇī, or lay man or woman'; at *StA* 71.1 (above p.266) where a dhāraṇī is given 'for the benefit and ease of many men, and for the sake of fulfilling all the hopes of the monks, nuns, lay men and women', etc., etc. When we add to passages of this kind the fact that in the majority of cases our texts are addressed simply to kulaputras and kuladuhitṛs, and that these terms generally "fail to distinguish between the priesthood and the lay follower" (A. Hirakawa, "The Rise of Mahāyāna Buddhism and its Relationship to the Worship of Stūpas", *Memoirs of the Toyo Bunko* 22 (1963) 71; also 73), the point is even more firmly established. It is also worth noting that this is by no means a new situation. The *Āṭānāṭiya suttanta* (i.e., its dhāraṇīs) is on several occasions explicitly said to be intended for 'bhikṣus, bhikṣuṇīs, lay men and women' (D iii 195, 203, 204, 205); likewise the *Upasenasūtra* is clearly intended for monks. All of this goes to support a recent, and hopefully a continuing trend to question the distinction between a 'lay or popular Buddhism' and 'monastic Buddhism' as a false one. Two good examples of this trend - made, be it noted, from very different points of view, and in reference to widely separated geographical locations -

are worth quoting:

"I find this term ['popular'] dangerously misleading. It implies, I think, a decline by most people, the *plebs*, from an ideal standard which is maintained by a few spiritual aristocrats, a relationship analogous to that between 'popular' and 'classical' music. By some it might even be understood to imply the religion of the laity as distinct from that of monks. To this latter assumption, which would be especially erroneous, I shall return below ... Monks fought in Duṭugämuṇu's army and sanctioned what he did. And how many Buddhists in Ceylon, even in this post-Dharmapāla era, never take part in *pirit* or transfer merit, practices they brand as 'popular'? I think the only sense in which it is accurate to describe these beliefs and practices as 'popular' is the everyday one of 'widely liked' or 'prevalent'. But if so used 'popular' no longer distinguishes merit transference from, say, the Four Noble Truths or alms-giving." R.F. Gombrich, *Precept and Practice. Traditional Buddhism in the Rural Highlands of Ceylon* (Oxford: 1971) 319).

"In this context reference is made also to a so-called 'lay-Buddhism'. The use of the terms 'Volksreligion' and 'Laienbuddhismus' is no doubt justifiable, although just what they refer to is in the last analysis often not altogether clear, and it is necessary explicitly to exclude any misunderstanding which might lead to the idea that these 'popular' forms belong exclusively, or at least predominantly, to the laity alone. In fact the concepts treated in this chapter are known to, and accepted by, even some of the most learned and orthodox monks; and the fact that they assign such concepts to the worldly ('jig rten pa = laukika) level of convention (tha sñad = vyavahāra) and surface truth (kun rjob = saṃvṛti), rather than to the level of absolute reality, does not change the fact that they do countenance them; indeed they assign the whole of the conditioned ('dus byas - saṃskṛta) - including their own monastic and philosophic conventions - to this very level. (Conversely, it is not impossible for a layman to show little interest in the so-called lay or popular Buddhism.) Contact with both monks and laymen thus leads one to the conviction

> that the familiar concept of 'popular' and 'lay' Buddhism remains in need of more precise structural definition ... (D. Seyfort Ruegg, "A Recent Work on the Religions of Tibet and Mongolia" *T'oung Pao* 61 (1976) 313-14.

The question here is, of course, directly related to that discussed above concerning the reluctance to admit that the readers and writers of texts like *SR* and *GP* actually believed in and were threatened by yakṣas and rākṣasas.

* * * * *

b. I have elsewhere written at some length on *Bhg* [11] (*IIJ* 19 (1977) 177-210) and although I do not wish to repeat myself I think it is worthwhile to at least summarize here what I have said. I began by noting that the presence of a passage promising assistance to those seeking rebirth in Sukhāvatī in a text devoted to Bhaiṣajyaguru who has his own buddhafield looks, at first sight, decidedly odd. But I also noted that there were a number of similar or parallel passages from other texts, and that when these other passages are taken into account this oddness substantially disappears. The majority of these similar passages come from Gilgit texts. At *Aj* 105.13 one of the 'blessings' conferred on those 'who would hear or preserve the name of the protector of the world (i.e. Śākyamuni)' is that "he goes to the buddhafield Sukhāvatī"; at *Aj* 106.14 it is said that "through only the entrance of the Blessed One (i.e., Śākyamuni) into the great city of Śrāvastī ninety nine koṭis of niyutas of hundreds of thousands of beings were established in the world-sphere Sukhāvatī"; at *Aj* 126.6 of him 'who gives gifts to the community of monks' ..."he goes quickly to that Sukhāvatī, to the most excellent buddhafield of Amitāyus". Rebirth in Sukhāvatī is said to result from hearing and obtaining a chapter from *SP* (*SP* 167.17); from hearing *Kv* (*Kv* 306.33); from hearing, having faith in, copying, worshipping, etc. *Kv* (*Kv* 269.15); from preserving *StA* (*StA* 64.6); from hearing *SR* and preserving the Good Law (*SR* XVIII 52); from preserving even a single four-lined gāthā from *SR* (*SR* XI 49); from hearing and then preserving *SR* (*SR* II 28); from reciting *Eka* (*Eka* 37.11); from worshipping *StA* (*StA* 53.5); from performing pūjā to "all the Tathāgatas in the ten directions" (*StA* 56.11). It is also said to be achieved by

one 'to whom *SR* is dear', 'who is established in and preserves it', "who has abandoned all perceptions", is "concentrated", etc. (*SR* XXXII 268f); and by one who has "obtained the stage of the disciplined", who "realizes the analytical knowledges", etc. (*SR* XXVIII 67f). After looking at these passages (and one from the *Aparimitāyur-(jñāna)-sūtra* and the *Bhadracaripraṇidhāna*) I framed my 'conclusions' in the following way:

> "In this sense, then, it must be obvious that the present paper is in no way intended as a complete and systematic study of the phenomenon in question. We have here attempted only to collect enough passages to establish the general currency and basic outline of a peculiar usage of the idea of rebirth in *Sukhāvatī*, a usage in which it appears that rebirth in *Sukhāvatī* has become disassociated from a specific cult of Amitābha and has become instead one of a number of generalized rewards or 'blessings' associated with such a wide variety of religious acts that it is virtually open to any member of the Mahāyāna community as a whole."

Now, although I think that it in no way affects the basic interpretation of these passages which I developed in *IIJ* 19, I must note here a weakness in my treatment there of *Kv*. This weakness involves two aspects. The first centers on the fact that I was very incomplete in my citations from *Kv*. In addition to 269.15 and 306.33, similar passages concerning Sukhāvatī are found at 264.11 (tadā tasya [Avalokita] sakāśāt kāraṇḍavyūhamahāyānasūtraratnarājaśabdo niścarati, tadā teṣāṃ [the dwellers in pretanagara] [illegible]mśatiśikharasamudgataṃ satkāyadṛṣṭiśailaṃ jñānavajreṇa bhittvā sarve [illegible]āvatyāṃ lokadhātāv upapannāḥ), 268.6 (ye avalokiteśvarasya ... nāmadheyam anusmaranti ... gacchanti sukhāvatīlokadhātum amitābhasya tathāgatasya saṃmukhaṃ dharmaśravaṇāya.), 271.20 (cited above p.244), 275.21 (sucetanās te sattvā ye tava nāmadheyam anusmaranti, gacchanti te sukhāvatīlokadhātum, amitābhasya tathāgatasya dharmam anusmaranti śṛṇvanti), 276.25 (spoken by Avalokita to Bali: api ca mahārāja mamāntikād dharmadeśanaṃ śṛṇvato niravaśeṣāṇi pāpaskandhāni na ca supariśuddhāni, sarvaduḥkhataragāḍhabandhanaiḥ parimuktaḥ, sukhāvatīlokadhātugamanāya tava panthānaṃ pariśuddham, tatra ca tava saptaratnamayaṃ padmāsanaṃ prādurbhūtaṃ bhaviṣyati, yatra ratnapadme niṣadya tasya bhagavato 'mitābhasya tathāgatasyārhataḥ samyak-

saṃbuddhasyāntikāt imaṃ sarvaduḥkhapāpaskandhaṃ pāpaśamanaṃ sarvadurgati-sādhanaṃ anantamaṇimahāpuṇyanirdeśaṃ kāraṇḍavyūhamahāyānaṃ sūtraratna-rājaṃ tvaṃ śroṣyasi, śrutvā ca tatraiva vyākaraṇam anuprāpsyase ..), and at 281.24 (cited above p.144).

The second aspect involves the following statement:

> "A second and related question is: if these passages are not interpolated, is there any direct connection between the texts in which they occur and the cult of Amitābha and its associated literature ? The answer for the majority of these texts is fairly certain: for *Bhg*, *Ap*, *Aj*, *SR*, *Bbp*, and probably for *SP* there is no evidence, either internal or external, apart from the passages we have studied above, that would even vaguely suggest such a connection. This would also be the case for *Kā*, *Sta* and *Eka* but for one factor. These three texts (and one late chapter of *SP* thus accounting for our hesitancy above concerning it) are intimately connected with the Bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara, and he, in turn, as is well known, is closely connected, at least in some aspects, with both the Buddha Amitābha and *Sukhāvatī*. If he could be shown to be invariably connected with Amitābha and to primarily and chiefly function as the representative of the latter, then this would have some significance for our discussion. As it nds though, both literary and archaeological evidence strongly suggest that he functioned primarily as the center of his own specific and independent cult, and that in spite of the fact that his association with Amitābha in some aspects was, up to a point, commonly in evidence, it was probably secondary in origin and, certainly, in importance. The three texts in question bear this out. In none of them is he characterized as the attendant of Amitābha; a relationship with Amitābha is not even hinted at. He is presented as a powerful and independent 'saviour'." (*IIJ* 19 (1977) 200).

The two sentences preceding the final one are - *in reference to Kv* - incorrect. *Kv*, in fact, has considerable to say on the 'formal' relationship of Avalokita to Amitābha. For example at 266.2, 12; 290.20 and 303.23 *Kv* makes it clear that Avalokita resides in Sukhāvatī or, perhaps better, uses Sukhāvatī as his 'base of operations'. On two occasions - 266.14 and 303.29 - Avalokita approaches Śākyamuni as the

emissary of Amitābha and asks in typical fashion, on behalf of Amitābha, concerning Śākyamuni's health. At 275.13 Avalokita is called, among other things, amitābhamūrti: 'the embodiment/manifestation/incarnation/ personification of Amitābha. At 296.1 Amitābha orders (dadasva) Avalokita to give the ṣaḍakṣarīmahāvidyā to a Tathāgata who seeks it, and at 297.7 that Tathāgata gives Avalokita a string of pearls, and the latter gives it in turn to Amitābha, who gives it back to the Tathāgata.

Now, without wanting to get fully involved in the question of Avalokita's origins, I think we can make the following observations.

1) Tucci notes: "First of all, I am rather doubtful that the connection between Avalokiteśvara and Amitābha is essential from the very beginning; this may be true as regards some texts, such as the Sukhāvatī, but we have no proof that it was generally accepted ... Moreover, the investigation itself of Mlle Mallmann has shown that the representation of Amitābha on the crest of Avalokiteśvara, as a fixed canon, is not testified by monuments earlier than the 9th century" (G. Tucci, "Buddhist Notes I: A propos Avalokiteśvara", *Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques* 9 (1951) 174). To this I can add that in both *StA* and *Eka* Avalokita is presented as completely independent and there is no reference to a relationship either to Amitābha or Sukhāvatī. Here he acts in reference to Śākyamuni alone. The same is true for the prose of *SP* XXIV (here, for example, when presented with a necklace, he divides it and gives half to Śākyamuni and half to Prabhūtaratna). The verse portion of *SP* XXIV which, as I have said, appears to be not a versified version of the prose, but an independent version of the same basic material, does refer to Amitābha. But this reference is tacked on at the very end and is somewhat incoherent. It is, as a matter of fact, impossible to determine from these final verses how the compiler of *SP* XXIV wanted the relationship between the two figures to be seen.

2) Apart from these wider questions we can note that in none of the passages referred to above from *Kv* does rebirth in Sukhāvatī result from religious activity undertaken in regard to Amitābha. He most definitely is not the cult figure. It results, however, from hearing or recollecting the name of Avalokita, hearing the name, copying or worshipping *Kv*, etc. When we compare this situation with that found in the *Sukhāvatīvyūha* it is immediately clear that Avalokita in this regard has completely displaced Amitābha as the cult figure: it is towards Avalokita and in reference to him that the individual acts. This means that in *Kv* we find two sets of relations, a formal one, and a cultic one. In the first,

Avalokita is formally subordinate to Amitābha; but in the second this relationship is reversed: cultically Amitābha is clearly subordinate to Avalokita.

3) Again, in all the above passages Amitābha in Sukhāvatī is the *goal of* or *reward* resulting from religious activity undertaken in regard to Avalokita or *Kv*. And in these passages we see the same basic pattern repeated: activity undertaken towards Avalokita or *Kv* results in rebirth in Sukhāvatī, which results in hearing dharma face-to-face from Amitābha, which results in obtaining one's prediction.

4) Now I think it is fairly obvious that the reader at Gilgit would have been familiar with an almost completely analogous relationship between two other prominent figures. The relationship *on the cultic level* between Śākyamuni and Maitreya in *Mvk* is almost exactly parallel to that between Avalokita and Amitābha: as in *Kv* religious activity undertaken towards Avalokita results in rebirth in Amitābha's buddhafield; so in *Mvk* religious activity undertaken in regard to Śākyamuni results in rebirth in Maitreya's world; as Avalokita is the cult figure in *Kv* and Amitābha's buddhafield the goal; so in *Mvk* Śākyamuni is the cult figure and Maitreya's world the goal; as in *Kv* the individual reborn in Sukhāvatī hears dharma from Amitābha and then obtains his prediction; so in *Mvk* the individual hears dharma from Maitreya and then 'effects the destruction of the outflows'. These parallelisms can, perhaps, be attributed to an even more fundamental parallel. We have seen above (p. 151) that the relationship between Śākyamuni and the world of Maitreya was made necessary by the fact that the cult follower of Śākyamuni could not be reborn in Śākyamuni's buddhafield, because he was already in it. In the same way - but for different reasons - the cult follower of Avalokita could not be reborn in Avalokita's buddhafield, because, in the beginning at least, he did not have one. It was, *perhaps*, to remedy this deficiency that a 'formal' relationship with Amitābha had to be postulated in spite of the fact that this 'formal' relationship was functionally denied by the relationship on the cultic level.

5) However the details might eventually be stated, it is clear from the above, that in *Kv* rebirth in Sukhāvatī has become disassociated from a specific cult of Amitābha. And it is in this sense that the above does not affect my conclusions in *IIJ*. This, however, is not to say that the situation in *Kv* is not in some ways slightly different from that in

the other texts in which we find similar passages. The chief difference seems to be this: *Kv* appears to be a concerted effort to attach the then disassociated reward of rebirth in Sukhāvatī to the cult of Avalokita alone, to de-generalize it. But even this, of course, must be seen in light of all the other parallel passages.

* * * *

c. Having said this much I would now like to turn to a more specific, though related, aspect of *Bhg* [11]. If, as I have suggested, death and the fear of death is the central concern of karmatic Buddhism, then we would expect that the 'moment of death' would have particular significance. This expectation is fully confirmed by our sources. We will cite first a couple of passages describing what the 'moment of death' is like for those who have not behaved well.

> *StA* 61.10; folio 1771.2: te ca sattvāḥ pāpasamācārāḥ khādyapeyahāsyanāṭyābhiratā aśubhe śubhasaṃjñinaḥ kāmakrodhavyāpādabahulā asukhe sukhasaṃjñinaḥ prahārākrośatarjanatāḍanābhiratā na jñāsyanti na manasi kariṣyanti. te tataḥ pāpakarmanidānājñānā akalyāṇamitraparigṛhītā jarāvyādhiśokamṛtyuparipīḍitā maraṇakāle paritapyaṃte smaśānasadṛśamaṃcāvalaṃbyamānaṃ parasparaṃ paśyaṃti na ca kuśalacittam utpādayiṣyanti nābhedyaprasādam, te tataś cyavitvā punar api duḥkhāni pratyanubhaviṣyanti.

> And those beings practicing evil, delighting in food and drink and laughing and dancing, perceiving the lovely in the unlovely, having much passion and anger and ill-will, perceiving happiness in that which is not happiness, delighting in fighting, abuse, threatening and blows, they will not understand, they will not fix their mind. They, as a consequence, are ignorant of the causes arising from evil action; they are taken hold of by the bad friend, are afflicted by old age, disease, sorrow and death. At the time of death they are tormented: they see one another being laid on their biers fit for the burning grounds and they will not (be able to) produce a good thought nor unbroken serenity. They then having passed away will once again experience sufferings.

Sgṭ 2247.4 (= 2065.3): evam eva bhaiṣajyasena ye mama śāsane na prasīdante paścāt maraṇakālasamaye paritapyamānāḥ paridevato duḥkhāṃ vedanāṃ vedayanti · pūrvakṛtāni ca puṇyāni paribhuktvā na bhūyo 'nyāni puṇyāni kurvanti sukṣetragatāni · tatra teṣāṃ puṇyaparikṣīṇānāṃ śokaśalyaparigatahṛdayānāṃ tena kālena tena samayena narakatiryagyoniyamalokopapattiṃ ghorāṃ dāruṇān dṛṣṭvā maraṇakālasamaye evaṃ bhavati · ko me trātā bhaved yad ahaṃ narakatiryakpretayamalokaviṣayaṃ na paśyeyan na ca tāṃ duḥkhāṃ vedanāṃ vedayeyaṃ · tasyaivaṃ pralapataḥ paralokam ākramataḥ.

Just so, Bhaiṣajyasena, those who do not have faith in my teaching, being tormented at the last moment of death, wailing, experience suffering. Having used up the merit formerly made, they have not made any further merit connected with this fertile field. As a consequence, to those whose merit is exhausted, whose hearts are afflicted by the sting of sorrow, at that time, on that occasion, having seen (for themselves) a dreadful, awful rebirth in the hells, among animals or in the world of Yama, at the moment of death it occurs thus: 'Who could be my protector so that I would not see the region of the hells, animals, pretas, or the world of Yama, and would not experience that suffering ?' Thus it occurs to him as, lamenting, he approaches the next world. (Cf. *Sgṭ* 2130.3, 2209.6, 222.2.)

StA fol. 1807.4 (= GMs i 84.1), Pek vol. 27, 278-3-6:

tasmā hi sūtraṃ imu dhārayeta
likheta vāceta tathā prakāśaye
imaṃ ca (śru)tvā tatha ānuśaṃsā
kṛtvā ca maitraṃ tatha sarvasatvai //
mā paścakāle paritāpyu bheṣyathaḥ
upapadyamānaṃ narakeṣu pretayo
jaravyādhi(mṛ)tyuparitāpyu pīḍita
[sdug bsṅal rab drag brgya yis yoṅs gduṅs la] //
sa mṛtyukāle bhayabhītamānaso
abhīkṣṇa uśvāsata·uśvasantaḥ
mukhe mukhaṃ prekṣati bālabuddhiḥ
kosmābhi trāṇaṃ bhaveta parāyaṇa //

[The text here is more than usually tentative; the whole series of verses of which it forms a part seems to be missing a number of padas; Dutt has completely and - as far as I can see - arbitrarily changed the order of the padas as found in the Ms.; and the Ms. here is difficult to read.]

> Therefore, having heard thus the blessings, and having established thus friendliness towards all beings, he should preserve this sūtra, he should thus copy, recite and illuminate it
>
> lest at the last time he would be tormented, being reborn in the hells or among pretas, tormented by old age, disease and death, afflicted, pained by hundreds of violent sufferings,
>
> (lest) at the moment of death his mind be terrified with fear; repeatedly panting, he with a childish mind looks from face to face (crying) 'through whom could there be protection or refuge !'

The potentially negative character, as well as the importance, attached to the 'moment of death' in Gilgit literature is also indicated by both the nature and number of another group of passages which give assurance to the individual regarding it.

> *Kv* 306.33 (text cited *IIJ* 19, 183): "Those beings will be delighted who will hear this Mahāyāna Sūtra, the *Kāraṇḍavyūha*, the king of jewels ... And at the time of their death twelve Tathāgatas, having approached, encourage them (saying): 'Do not be afraid, O son of good family! By you the *Kāraṇḍavyūha*, the king of the jewels of Mahāyāna Sūtras, was heard. Surely not again by you is saṃsāra to be undergone.. Not again, moreover, will there be for you birth, old age and death. There then will not be a disjunction from the agreeable and lovely, a conjunction with the unlovely. You, O son of good family, will go to the world-sphere of Sukhāvatī. You will repeatedly hear dharma in the presence of the Tathāgata Amitābha'. Thus, O son of good family, of those beings there will be a happy death."

> *Kv* 269.19, Lhasa 166-4-3: [said of those who hear, copy, worship *Kv*] maraṇakāle dvādaśa tathāgatā upasaṃkramiṣyanti, te ca sarve tathāgatā āśvāsayiṣyanti: mā bhaiṣīḥ kulaputra tvayā kāraṇḍavyūhaṃ mahāyānasūtraratnarājaṃ śrutam, vividhās te 'rthamargāḥ sajjīkṛtāḥ

sukhāvatīgamanāya ca, tatra sukhāvatyāṃ lokadhātau tavārthe vicitraṃ ca te chatraṃ siṃhāsanaṃ sajjīkṛtaṃ divyamaulīkuṇḍalasragdāmam; īdṛśasya nimittam maraṇakālasamayaparipanthita eva sukhāvatīm anugacchati (ltas de lta bu 'byuṅ źiṅ 'chi ba'i dus kyi tshe bar chad med par bde ba can du 'gro bar 'gyur ro /)

At the time of their death twelve Tathāgatas will approach, and all those Tathāgatas will encourage them (saying): 'Do not be afraid, o son of good family! By you the *Kāraṇḍavyūha* ... was heard. For you many paths going to Sukhāvatī are prepared; and there in Sukhāvatī for your sake a wonderful umbrella, a lion seat, a heavenly diadem, ear-rings and a garland are prepared'. Such a sign appearing at the moment of death, they will go to Sukhāvatī without an obstacle. [The last sentence is translated from the Tibetan. I do not understand the Sanskrit.]

[It is worth noting that although the individual is to be reborn in Sukhāvatī, in both cases it is not Amitābha that appears to him at the moment of death, but twelve unnamed Tathāgatas. This, of course, is in marked contrast with what is promised at least three times to a follower of the cult of Amitābha (*Sukhāvatīvyūha* (Ashikaga ed.) 13.25, 42.12; *Smaller Sukhāvatīvyūha* (Müller ed.) 96.15), and this, in turn, is another piece of evidence indicating the disassociation of *Kv* from the Amitābha cult.]

Sgṭ 1960.3 (= 2122.4, although the two differ somewhat; the text of 2122.4 is cited above p. 159): [Said of one who "having a devout mind, will wholeheartedly reverence the *Saṃghāṭa Sūtra*"] maraṇakāle ca navatibuddhakoṭīḥ saṃmukhaṃ drakṣyati te cāsya sarve buddhā bhagavanta āśvāsayiṣyanti: mā bhaiḥ puruṣas tvayā saṃghāṭo mahādharmaparyāya śrūto lekhito, mahāpuṇyaskandhaś ca te prasūtaḥ; teṣāṃ paṃcanavati buddhakoṭyaḥ pṛthakpṛthaglokadhātuṣu vyākariṣyaṃti·

And at the time of his death he will see ninety koṭīs of Buddhas face-to-face; and all those Buddhas, Blessed Ones will encourage him (saying): 'Do not be afraid, man! By you the great dharmaparyāya (called) *Saṃghāṭa* was heard, written, and for you a great heap of merit was produced.' Ninetyfive koṭīs of Buddhas will give them their prediction in various world-spheres.

Sgṭ 1994.4 (= 2161.3): [Said of those on whose ears the *Saṃghāta Sūtra* would fall] maraṇakālasamaye carimavijñānanirodhe vartamāne na viparītasaṃjñī bhaviṣyati · na krodhābhibhūto bhaviṣyati · sa pūrvasyān diśi dvādaśagaṃgānadībālukāsamāṃ buddhāṃ bhagavato drakṣyati ... [similarly for the other directions, up to:] ... adhastād diśi koṭīśataṃ gaṃgānadībālikāsamāṃ buddhāṃ bhagavataḥ saṃmukhaṃ drakṣyati · te sarve taṃ kulaputram āśvāsayiṣyaṃti · mā bhaiḥ kulaputra tava saṃghāṭaṃ dharmaparyāyaṃ śrutvā iyantaḥ sāṃparāyikāni guṇāni sukhāni ca bhaviṣyanti ·

At the moment of death, when the suppression of the final consciousness occurs, he will not have an inverted perception; he will not be overcome with anger. He will see in the eastern direction Buddhas, Blessed Ones, equal in number to the sands in twelve Ganges Rivers ... [up to:] ... in the nadir he will see face-to-face Buddhas, Blessed Ones, equal in number to the sands in koṭīs of hundreds of Ganges Rivers. They all will encourage that son of good family (saying): 'Do not be afraid, son of good family! Having heard the dharmaparyāya (called) *Saṃghāṭa* there will be so many good qualities and happinesses connected with the future life.'

Rkp 173.11, Pek 219-3-8, [As the last of ten dharmas which are promised to beings who in a future time will take up, copy, etc. *Rkp*]: maraṇakālasamaye ca te sa(t)tvā(ḥ) purastād apremyā-saṃkhyeyā(n) buddhā(n) bhagavataḥ bhikṣugaṇaparivṛtāṃ bodhisa(t)tva-gaṇapuraskṛtāṃ tiṣṭhato yāpayato dharman deśayamānā(n) drakṣyaṃti; teṣāṃ ca buddhānāṃ bhagavatām antikā(t) tādṛśam arthapadavyaṃja-nopetan dharman deśyamānaṃ [Ms. deśayamānā] śroṣyaṃti; yat sarva-viśiṣṭam āryaṃ nirāmiṣaprītiprāmodyaṃ pratilabdhā(ḥ) sarva(ṃ) tat karmāvaraṇam akuśalam carimavijñāne samaś(.) [rd. samaśīrṣam?; mgo mñam du] teṣāṃ sahadharmeṇa nirotsyaṃti; sarvābhiprāyeṇa ca pari-śuddheṣu buddhakṣetreṣv aupapādika upapatsyaṃte, yeṣu buddhakṣetreṣu buddhā bhagavantas tiṣṭhaṃto yāpayantaḥ śuddhāṃ mahāyānakathāṃ deśaṃti teṣu buddhakṣetreṣu te sa(t)tvās tair mahāyānasaṃprasthitair anāvaraṇajñānasamanvāgatair gaganasamacittaiḥ sārdha(ṃ) saṃvasiṣyaṃti.

And at the moment of death those beings will see before them innumerable and incalculable Buddhas, Blessed Ones, surrounded by assemblies of bhikṣus, attended by assemblies of bodhisattvas,

standing, abiding, remaining and teaching dharma. In the presence of those Buddhas, Blessed Ones, they will hear such teachings of dharma possessed of (good) meaning and sentences and sound that (since) the best of all, the noble, spiritual joy and rejoicing is obtained, all the unmeritorious obstruction from past action in the final consciousness will be equally(?) suppressed through their being in harmony with dharma (las kyi sgrib pa mi dge ba de dag thams cad rnam par śes pa tha ma la chos daṅ ldan pas mgo mñam du 'grag par 'gyur ro /); and in accordance with their intention they are reborn miraculously in very pure buddhafields. In which buddhafields standing, abiding, Buddhas, Blessed Ones, teach pure talks on the Mahāyāna; in those buddhafields those beings will dwell together with those who have set out in the Mahāyāna, etc.

Apart from longer passages of this kind we might note the following: at *SP* 176.10 we find it said of one who with undistracted mind will copy the text: maraṇakāle cāsya buddhasahasraṃ mukhaṃ upadarśayiṣyanti, na ca durgativinipātagāmī bhaviṣyati, itaś cyu[taś ca tuṣitānāṃ devānāṃ sabhāgatāyopapatsyate, etc.]: 'And at the time of death he will see a thousand Buddhas face-to-face, and he will not undergo a downfall or unfortunate destiny; and, passed away from here, he will be reborn among the Tuṣita devas, etc.' At *Sgt* 2157.6 (= 1990.4), Lhasa 187-3-1: yadā ca brahmacaryaṃ cariṣyati · tadā sammukhaṃ tathāgataṃ drakṣyati · rātrindivaṃ ca tathāgatadarśanaṃ bhaviṣyati · yadā tathāgataṃ paśyati tadā buddhakṣetraṃ paśyati · yadā buddhakṣetraṃ paśyati tadā sarvadharmanidhānāni paśyati tadāsya maraṇakāla(samaye) ... [de 'gum pa'i dus kyi tshe skrag pa skye bar mi 'gyur] · na jātu mātuḥ kukṣāv upapatsyate · [nam du 'aṅ mya ṅan can du mi 'gyur] · na ca sa tṛṣṇāpāśabaddho bhaviṣyati [both Mss. are either fragmentary or difficult to read, so I have filled the gaps from the Tib.]: 'And when he will practise continence, then he will see the Tathāgata face-to-face; and day and night there will be a vision of the Tathāgata. When he sees the Tathāgata, then he sees the buddhafield. When he sees the buddhafield, then he sees the treasures of all dharmas [Tib. has only gter thams cad], then at the moment of his death [fear will not arise;] he will never be reborn in the womb of a woman; [he will never be one who sorrows]; and he will not be bound by the snares of desire.' At *Eka* 37.12, Lhasa 236-2-3, as one of the 'blessings' from 'reciting' *Eka:* maraṇakāle tathāga[tada]rśanaṃ bhaviṣyati (de bźin gśegs pa mthoṅ bar 'gyur pa) · na

cāpāyeṣūpapatsyate ... itaś c[y]utaḥ sukhāvatyāṃ lokadhātāv upapatsyate: 'At the time of death there will be a vision of the Tathāgata [Tib., at least, takes it as sing.]; and he will not be reborn in an unfortunate state; passed away from here he will be reborn in Sukhāvatī'. At *StA* 54.1, Pek. 272-2-8, of one who worships, preserves, etc., *StA:* maraṇakāle cāsya buddhadarśana(ṃ) bodhisattvadarśanaṃ bhaviṣyaṃti (saṅs rgyas daṅ byaṅ chub sems dpa' dag mthoṅ bar yaṅ 'gyur ro) · na īrṣyāluko na vikṣepacitta kāla(m) kariṣyati // yāva cyuto sukhāvatyā lokadhātāv upapadyate: 'At the time of death there will be for him a vision of the Buddhas, a vision of the bodhisattvas; he will not die having envious thoughts, scattered thoughts, up to: passed away from here he is reborn in the world-sphere Sukhāvatī'; at *StA* 56.18, Pek. 273-1-2, of one who performs the ritualized recitation of a mantrapada: maraṇakāle ca tathāgatadarśanaṃ bhaviṣyati (de bźin gśegs pa mthoṅ bar yaṅ 'gyur ro) · cyutvā sukhāvatyāṃ co lokadhātu upapatsyate: 'And at the time of death there will be a vision of the Tathāgata; and having passed away, he will be reborn in the world-sphere Sukhāvatī'. [Note: In the last three passages, although the individual is said to be reborn in Sukhāvatī, it is again not Amitābha who appears to him at the moment of death. In one case it is a plurality of unspecified Buddhas and Bodhisattvas; in the other two it is a single unspecified Tathāgata, and, if we judge by the context, the implication is that this unspecified Tathāgata is Śākyamuni.] At *StA* 59.10, Pek. 273-4-1, Vajrapāṇi says concerning the individual who performs the ritualized recitation of mantrapadas which he has given: maraṇakāle ca buddhaṃ paśyati (saṅs rgyas bcom ldan 'das stoṅ mthoṅ bar 'gyur lags so). aham ca darśanaṃ dāsyāmi: 'And at the time of death he sees the Buddha (T: 'He would see a thousand Buddhas, Blessed Ones'); and I will give (him) a vision (of myself)'; at *StA* 70.4, Pek. 274-4-8, of one who undertakes the ritualized recitation of yet another set of mantrapadas: cyavanakāle buddham bhagavantam (Tib. pl. rnams) āryāvalokiteśvaraṃ paśyati, maitravihārī kālaṃ karoti dharmaṃ deśayamānaṃ; yathepsiteṣu buddhakṣetreṣu mahācakravartikuleṣu yatrānusmṛtiṃ karoti tatropapadyate: 'At the time of dying he sees the Buddha(s), the Blessed One(s) (and) Avalokiteśvara; he dies dwelling in friendliness and reciting dharma. In buddhafields (or) families of great cakravartins according with his wishes, where(ver) he fixes his recollection, there he is reborn'. Finally, at *SR* IV 21, as one of the results of practising the buddhānusmṛti which gives the chapter its name, we find: yadāpi so bhoti gilāna

āturaḥ / pravartate vedana [māraṇāntikā / na buddham ārabhya smṛtiḥ pramuṣyate / na vedanābhi]r anusaṃharīyati: 'When he is sick, ill; (when) the feelings connected with death occur, (his) recollection of the Buddha is not stolen (and) he is not carried away by (those) feelings'.

Apart from the fact that these passages richly document the importance of 'the moment of death' in the Buddhism of Gilgit, I have cited them at such length because almost any one of them taken in isolation can be easily misunderstood. This potential misunderstanding arises from the fact that they superficially exhibit a more or less marked resemblance to passages of two different but related kinds. These other passages concern the determining influence of the moment of death on the individual's future rebirth, and what has been called "the dying wish". Both ideas are known from textual sources as well as recent anthropological studies (F. Edgerton, "The Hour of Death, Its Importance for Man's Future Fate in Hindu and Western Religions", *Annals of the Bhandarkar Institute* 8 (1926-27) 219-49; C. Caillat, "Fasting Unto Death According to the Jaina Tradition", *Acta Orientalia* 38 (1977) 62; etc. And Spiro, *Buddhism and Society*, 248; Gombrich, *Precept and Practice*, 219-26; G. Obeyesekere, "Theodicy, Sin and Salvation in a Sociology of Buddhism", in E.R. Leach, *Dialectic in Practical Religion* (Cambridge: 1968) 25f.). The most succinct expression of the first is from a Jain commentary cited by Edgerton: "maraṇasamaye yādṛśī matiḥ syāt, tādṛśī gatiḥ syāt, 'As the mental make-up is at the moment of death, so is the future fate' (p.225)"; and this was held to be the case often regardless of the character of the individual's previous actions (p.222). In addition to Jain texts, Edgerton has also shown the currency of this idea in Hindu and in Buddhist - almost exclusively Pāli - literature (to the latter might be added several cases from the *Vimānavatthu*, nos. 53, 83, and the *Petavatthu*, nos. 1, etc.) and the attempts in Buddhist scholastic literature to "rationalize" this "belief". The second of these ideas is expressed by Gombrich in the following form: "There is a belief that if a person on his death-bed aspires to be reborn in a particular state, his wish may well take effect. (p.219)". Now I would not want to deny that many of the passages I have cited above - especially *Rkp* 173.11 and *StA* 70.4 - superficially have much in common with either one or another or both of these ideas. But there seems to be one crucial difference. In the passages discussed by Edgerton et al the state of mind or wish expressed at the moment of death is the *determining factor* in the individual's

future course. In *all* of my passages, however, the state of mind or wish expressed at the moment of death is the, or one of the, *determined factor(s)* in the individual's future course. That is to say, it is determined by or results, negatively, from 'practising evil', 'not having faith in the Buddha's teaching', etc.; or, positively, from hearing, copying, worshipping etc., *Kv*, *Sgṭ*, *StA*, *Eka*, *SP*, *Rkp*, 'practising continence' or buddhānusmṛti, performing the ritualized recitation of certain mantrapadas, etc. This, I think, is a very different thing. The *primary* function of the passages I have cited appears to be to assure the individual of, in the words of *Kv*, a sukhamaraṇa, "une mort très douce". This is confirmed by the fact that a number of these passages make no reference at all to the nature of the future rebirth (*Sgṭ* 1960.3, 1994.4, 2247.4, *StA* 1807.4, 59.10, *SR* IV 21), and with two possible exceptions (*Rkp* 173.11, *StA* 70.4), in none of those that do is there any indication that there is a direct causal link between the individual's state of mind and his future state. If the ideas discussed by Edgerton et al have any role here, they are clearly secondary and, in fact, their entire significance is undercut: even if the 'state of mind' or expressed wish at the moment of death remains a determining factor, here both are themselves determined by the previous action or lack of action on the part of the individual, and it is this previous determination which is pivotal. What the exact 'historical' or 'chronological' relationship of passages like those cited from Gilgit is to those cited by Edgerton remains to be determined and will require a close comparison of all the passages involved. Here, however, I think this much is clear: the Gilgit passages represent a much more conservative stance vis-à-vis the karmatically constructed world. They do not, for example, require the additional "rationalizations" found in Pāli scholastic literature.

In spite of the above I do not want to give the impression that the idea that the 'state of mind' at the moment of death is a determining factor for the individual's future rebirth is not found at Gilgit. It is. But only very rarely. I have noted only two instances. (Of the 'dying wish' I have noted no unequivocal case.) The first of these is *SR* XXXII 103, Pek. 6-4-1:

> cyute mṛte kālagate yasya cintā pravartate
> cintānusāri vijñānaṃ nāsau cintānta mucyate //
> śi 'phos dus byas śi ba'i tshe // gaṅ gi bsam pa rab 'jug pa //
> bsam pa'i rjes su rnam śes 'braṅ // bsam las de ni ma thar to //

> Of whom at the time of passing away, death, dying, a thought occurs, (his) consciousness follows that thought; that in the end is not freed from thought.

Note that vijñāna here is to be taken, as we will see below, as that 'thing' which transmigrates. Note also the context in which this verse occurs: it is one verse in a long, finely tuned, pun-filled discussion of saṃjñā, cintā, acintiya; and is therefore in tone, if nothing else, far removed from the kind of passage cited by Edgerton.

The second instance is in *GP*; I will also cite the Nepalese version of this passage:

GP 156b.6	Kimura (II-3) 257.13
yeṣāṃ ca devaputrāṇāṃ devakanyānāṃ vā cyutikālasyānte cātmana apāyopapati paśyeyus teṣāṃ kauśika purata imāṃ prajñāpāramitāṃ svādhyāyaṃ kuryās te tena kuśalamūlena prajñāpāramitāśravaṇena tatraiva devabha[va]neṣūpapatsyante.	yeṣāṃ ca devaputrāṇam devakanyānāṃ vā cyutikālo bhavet teṣāṃ api purataḥ svādhyāyaṃ kuryās, te yady ātmano 'pāyopapattiṃ drakṣyanti teṣāṃ enāṃ prajñāpāramitāṃ śṛṇvatāṃ te 'pāyopapatticittotpādā antardhāsyanti tatraiva devabhavane te utpatsyante.
For those devaputras or devakanyas who at the final point of the moment of death would see for themselves a rebirth in an unfortunate state - you, Kauśika, in their presence should perform a recitation of this Perfection of Wisdom. They, through that root of merit, through hearing the Perfection of Wisdom, will be reborn just there in the abode of devas (instead).	For which devaputras or devakanyas the moment of death appears, in their presence you should perform a recitation. If they will see for themselves a rebirth in an unfortunate state, the production of thoughts of rebirth in an unfortunate state will disappear for those hearing this Perfection of Wisdom. They will be reborn just there in the abode of devas (instead).

This is the only case I know of at Gilgit of a death-bed ritual whose intention was to immediately influence or alter favorably the future course of the individual's rebirth. In this it contrasts with *Bhg* [17], the one other death-bed ritual found at Gilgit. As we have seen above (p. 132) and will see again below, the ritual performed at *Bhg* [17] is intended not to alter the course of the individual's rebirth - in fact it is explicitly stated there that his 'fate' is determined by his

previous acts - but to ensure that the individual will have an opportunity to hear the name of Bhaiṣajyaguru, as a consequence of which wherever he is reborn he will have jātismara and thus refrain from future unmeritorious action. This again is a long way from the ideas discussed by Edgerton, Gombrich, etc.

We will deal with other aspects of the 'moment of death', notably the role of the vijñāna, under *Bhg* [17]. I should also mention here that I do not know who the eight bodhisattvas are who, according to *Bhg* [11], appear to the individual at the moment of death, nor have I found any other reference to eight bodhisattvas at Gilgit; cf. M.W. de Visser, *Ancient Buddhism in Japan*, Vol. II (Leiden: 1935) 554f.).

[12]

Again, by which woman the name of that Tathāgata will be heard, (will be) taken up, this existence as a woman is to be anticipated as her last.

See above under [5.8].

[13]

Then again Mañjuśrī, the true heir-apparent, said this to the Blessed One: 'I, O Blessed One, in the last time, in the last period, will cause those believing sons and daughters of good family to hear the name of the Blessed One, Bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabha, the Tathāgata, through various means, even to the extent that I will recite the Buddha's name in their ears when they have gone to sleep. Who will preserve this sūtra, will recite, teach, will illuminate it in detail for others, will copy or have it copied, or will worship it written as a book with various flowers, garlands, perfumes, unguents, aromatic powders, robes, umbrellas, flags and banners - by them it is to be wrapped with cloths of five colors, on a pure spot it is to be set up: there where this sūtra will circulate the Four Great Kings together with their retinues, and koṭīs of hundreds of thousands of other devatās will approach. [1)] Who will preserve this sūtra, and the name of the Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabha, the Tathāgata, and the extent of the excellence of his former vows [(1] - not for them will there be an untimely death, and it is not possible for their vital warmth to be stolen away by any means; or else, their vital warmth being stolen, they again recover it.

1)(1 T: 'Who preserves the name of the Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabha and this sūtra of the extent of the excellence of (his) former vows'.

I think virtually everything of importance in this passage has already been noted.

[14]

The Blessed One said: 'That is so, Mañjuśrī, just as you say. And, Mañjuśrī, which believing sons or daughters of good family have a desire to do pūjā to that Tathāgata, by them an image of that Tathāgata is to be caused to be made; for seven days and nights the fast possessed of eight worthy limbs is to be undertaken; having eaten pure food, on a pure spot covered with various flowers, perfumed with various fragrant substances, on a spot of earth fully adorned with various cloths and umbrellas and flags and banners, with well bathed limbs, wearing pure and spotless garments, [1)] they are to be possessed of clean thought, unmuddied thought, thought without malice[(1]; with music and cymbals and singing sounded forth that image of the Tathāgata is to be circumambulated; the former vow[2] of that Tathāgata is to be fixed in mind; this sūtra is to be proclaimed[3]. What they think of, what they wish for, they accomplish that, the whole of their wish: if they wish for the state of long life, they come to be long-lived; if they wish for objects of enjoyment, there come to be abundant objects of enjoyment; if they wish for lordship, they obtain it with little difficulty; if they are desirous of a son, they obtain a son. Those who see an evil dream in which a crow appears, or see bad omens in which case a hundred misfortunes are imminent, [4)] they do the performance of pūjā in various ways to the Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabha, the Tathāgata[(4 5)] (and) they do not see any bad dream or bad omen or inauspicious things[(5]. Of whom there is a fear of fire, a fear of water[6], of mad elephants, of lions and tigers, a fear of bears, hyenas, venomous snakes, scorpions, and centipedes - by them pūjā to that Tathāgata is to be performed; from all fears they will be

released. Of whom there is a fear of foreign armies, of robbers, of thieves - by them pūjā to that Tathāgata is to be performed.

1)(1X: 'They are to be possessed of clean thought, unmuddied thought, a thought of friendliness towards all beings, an equable thought in the presence of all beings'; Z: 'They are to be possessed of clean thought, unmuddied thought, thought without malice, a thought of friendliness, a thought of advantage towards all beings, a thought of compassion, of sympathetic joy, of evenmindedness, an equable thought'; T: 'They are to be of clean thought, unmuddied thought, thought without malice, friendly thought, evenminded thought, and equable thought'. 2)X: 'vows'. 3)I have usually translated pra-kāś- as 'illuminate', but that does not fit very well here. X's pravartayitavya is also somewhat difficult to translate *exactly* (cf. *Eka* 37.4), although it can easily mean something like 'recite'. 4)(4X: 'By them pūjā to the Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabha, the Tathāgata, is to be performed', which gives an easier reading. 5)(5X: 'And the occurrence of all bad dreams, bad omens and inauspiciousness will be allayed (?)'. 6)X and T add 'fear of poison, sword and falls'.

---

a. As I have already indicated in passing, the literature of Gilgit is comparatively rich in what might be called liturgical texts. These 'texts', found above all in the shorter karmatic sūtras - *Bhg, Bbp, StA,* especially - give more or less detailed instructions for the performances of ritual acts. We might here look at some of these texts in detail.

Bhg contains at least two of these liturgical texts. One is, of course, the first part of [14]; the second is *Bhg* [18]:

> '...by them [i.e. friends, relatives and kinsmen] for the sake of that sick man, for seven days and nights the obligation of the Upoṣadha possessed of eight limbs is to be undertaken, and to the community of bhikṣus pūjā and service is to be performed with food and drink, with all requisites, according to one's abilities; three times in the night, three times in the day, to the Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabha, the Tathāgata, worship is to be performed; forty-nine times this sūtra is to be recited; forty-nine lamps are to be lighted; seven images are to be made; for each image seven lamps are to be set up; each lamp is to be made the size of

the wheel of a cart. If on the forty-ninth day the light is not exhausted, forty-nine five-coloured flags are to be made (visible ?).

Bbp also contains one such text:

Bbp 193-2-3f: gal te rigs kyi bu 'am rigs kyi bu mo .... sems can dmyal ba mnar med par 'gro ba daṅ / ṅan soṅ gsum du skyes pa'i sems can rnams kyi don daṅ / grogs po daṅ gñen rnams yoṅs su thar bar bya ba'i phyir de bźin gśegs pa de dag gi ri mo'i sku gzugs daṅ / 'jim pa'i sku gzugs byed du 'jug ciṅ / byed du bcug nas kyaṅ sems can thams cad la sñiṅ rje ba'i sems gtso bor byas te / 'phags pa'i lam yan lag brgyad pa daṅ ldan par gyur nas zla ba yar gyi tshes brgyad nas brtsams te bcva lṅa'i bar du de bźin gśegs pa de dag la me tog daṅ / spos daṅ / dri daṅ / phreṅ ba daṅ / byug pa daṅ / mar me daṅ / sil sñan daṅ rgyal mtshan daṅ ba dan rnams kyis mtshan lan gsum ñin lan gsum du mchod de / sems can de dag thar bar bya ba'i phyir ci nas kyaṅ saṅs rgyas bcom ldan 'das de dag de bźin gśegs pa'i ye śes kyis ni mkhyen / lha'i sñan gyis ni gsan / lha'i spyan gyis ni gzigs śiṅ sems can de dag bde 'gror 'gro bar 'gyur gyi ṅan 'gror 'gro bar mi 'gyur ba daṅ / legs par bya ba byed kyi ṅan par bya ba mi byed par yoṅs su bsṅo źiṅ de ltar sems can ṅan soṅ du skyes pa de dag thar bar bgyi ba'i slad du de bźin gśegs pa de dag la gsol ba gdab po / bśags pa daṅ / mthol bas sdig pa bśags par gyur cig / de bźin gśegs pa'i mtshan thos par gyur cig / ṅan 'gro thams cad las yoṅs su grol bar gyur cig / ji srid du bla na med pa yaṅ dag par rdzogs pa'i byaṅ chub tu mṅon par rdzogs par saṅs ma rgyas kyi bar du bdag gi[s] spyod pa daṅ 'thun par spyod par gyur cig ces de ltar yoṅs su bsṅo bar bya'o // chos kyi rnam graṅs 'di yaṅ bris pa daṅ / 'drir bcug pa daṅ / bcaṅs pa daṅ / klags pa daṅ / mchod pa de'i phyir sṅon gyi de bźin gśegs pa de dag gi smon lam gyi mthus sems can [dmyal ba] mnar med par 'gro ba daṅ / ṅan soṅ gsum du skyes pa de dag gi rna bar mtshan rnams thos par 'gyur ro /

If a son or daughter of good family ... for the benefit of those beings who have gone to the Avīci hell, or have been born in the three unfortunate destinies, or for the sake of releasing friends and relatives, has painted images or images of clay of those Tathāgatas made [i.e. of Bhaiṣajyaguru, Amitābha, Śikhin, Kāśyapa, etc.]; and having had them made also directs the most excellent thought of compassion towards all beings, and having become possessed of the

eight-limbed worthy path, from the eighth day of the waxing moon until the fifteenth, three times a day and three times a night, does pūjā to those Tathāgatas with flowers, perfumes, scents, garlands, unguents, lamps, cymbals, flags and banners; and [if], for the sake of freeing those beings, [1]he turns over [the resulting merit] as it is known by those Buddhas, Blessed Ones, through the cognition of a Tathāgata, (as it is) heard by (their) deva-ear and seen by (their) deva-eye(1, so that those beings would go to a fortunate destiny and would not go to an unfortunate destiny, and would do good and would not do bad; so, for the sake of releasing those beings born in the unfortunate destinies, those Tathāgatas are to be addressed: 'Through confession and declaration evil must be curbed[2]!' 'The names of those Tathāgatas must be heard!' '[Beings] must be released from all unfortunate destinies!' 'As long as [I] am not fully and completely awakened to utmost, right and complete awakening, so long must I practise in conformity with this practice!' - thus is it to be turned over. On account of also writing, having copied, preserving, reading and worshipping this discourse on dharma, through the power of the vows of those former Tathāgatas, (their) names would be heard in the ears of those gone to the Avīci hell and those born in the three unfortunate destinies, etc.

1)(1 The Tibetan text is here very difficult and my translation uncertain. I have translated it in light of such passages as *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* (Mitra ed.) 153.4f: kathaṃ ca pariṇāmitaṃ supariṇāmitaṃ bhavaty anuttarāyāṃ samyaksaṃbodhau ... yathā te tathāgatā arhantaḥ samyaksaṃbuddhā buddhajñānena buddhacakṣuṣā jānanti paśyanti tatkuśalamūlaṃ yajjātikaṃ ... yallakṣaṇaṃ ... tathā anumode tatkuśalamūlaṃ yathā ca te tathāgatā ... abhyanujānanti pariṇamyamānaṃ tatkuśalamūlam anuttarāyām samyaksaṃbodhau tathāhaṃ pariṇāmayāmīti, but remain doubtful as to whether this represents the most satisfactory solution. 2) Both Sde dge and Snar thaṅ read bsrabs par gyur cig instead, and this reading is probably to be preferred.

Of all the texts at Gilgit, undoubtedly the richest in terms of liturgical texts is *StA*. I can here only give a few examples. In the first two cases I will give the 'mantrapada' both because it is an integral part of the ritual, and because it is important to have a clear idea of its exact nature. These mantrapadas are dhāraṇīs - they are called both - are not, as I have already noted, the meaningless (to us) strings of

syllables common in Tantric mantras. They are most like invocatory prayers. It is also important to note the role that the recitation of these mantrapadas plays in the rituals of *StA* vis-à-vis the recitation of texts, the names of Buddhas, etc., in *Bhg* and *Bbp*.

First the mantrapada:

namaḥ sarvatathāgatānāṃ tadyathā buddhe subuddhe buddhamate[1] loke viloke lokātikrānte satvāvalokane[2] sarvatathāgatādhiṣṭānādhiṣṭhite sarvāśāparipūraṇe dyutindhare naradevapūjite[3] tathāgatajñānadade tathāgatādhiṣṭhāne(na)[4] sarvalokaṃ sukhī bhavatu pūrvakarmaṃ kṣapaya mama rakṣā bhavatu sarvabhayebhya tathāgatādhiṣṭhānena svāhā /

1)So both Ms & T; Dutt śuddhamate. 2) A: -lokena; T: lo ki ni. 3)So A & T; B deest; Dutt narake ca pūjite. 4)A: unclear, but almost certainly -ena; B: deest; T:-nena; Dutt: -ṣṭhāne.

Homage to all the Tathāgatas! To wit: O Awakened, O Well Awakened, O One Having Awakened Thought, O One of the World, O One Apart from the World, O One Having Gone Beyond the World, O One who is Looking Down on Beings, O One Empowered with the Power of All Tathāgatas, O One Fulfilling All Hopes, O Brilliant One, O One Worshipped by Men and Devas, O One Giving the Knowledge of a Tathāgata, through the power of the Tathāgata may all the world become happy, may previous karma be caused to be exhausted, may there be for me protection from all fears through the power of the Tathāgata! All Hail!

Then the ritual itself:

StA: GMs i 56.11-56.20; Ms. no.30 (= Ms.A), fol. 1760.4-1761.5; Ms. no. 35 (= Ms.B), fol. 1822L.5-1823L.5, Pek. vol. 27, 272-5-6 to 273-1-4.

yaḥ kaścit pārṣā[1] evaṃ jñānīyuḥ kathaṃ nu vayaṃ sarvān etān tathāgatabhāṣitān guṇān pratilabheya, tena kalyam evotthāya sarvasattvānāṃ dayācittena karuṇācittena maitracittena īrṣyāmānamrakṣakrodhaparivarjitena[2] ekāgracittena buddhasyodāratarāṃ[3] pūjāṃ kṛtvā daśadiśam sarvatathāgatānāṃ namaskṛtvā yathākāmam gamān[4] manasikṛtya[5] 6)aṣṭaśataṃ japya puṣpaṃ ekaikaṃ tathāgate deyam(6 / tatas tasya sarvāśāsamṛddhir bhaviṣyati / svapne ca tathāgatadarśanaṃ bhaviṣyati /

yaṃ varaṃ icchati taṃ labhate / maraṇakāle ca tathāgatadarśanaṃ bhaviṣyati / cyutvā sukhāvatyāṃ ca lokadhātau upapatsyate / āyurbalavarṇavīryasamanvāgataḥ / sarvaśatravaś cāsya vaśagāmino bhaviṣyanti /

[1] Dutt: parṣa; T: grogs po dag. [2] B: -krodhamrakṣa-.
[3] B: -odārāṃ; T: saṅs rgyas daṅ byaṅ chub sems dpa' rnams la mchod pa śin tu rgya cher byas la. [4] A: (gamā); B: gamāḥ; T: gaṅ 'dod pa. Dutt's guṇān has no basis in the Mss. [5] B: -kartavyaḥ; T: yid la byas nas. [6](6 T: me tog la bzlas brjod laṅ brgya rtsa brgyad bya źiṅ de bźin gśegs pa la re re nas dbul bar bya'o /

Whatsoever assembly would think thus: 'How now may we obtain all those qualities spoken of by the Tathāgata ?' By one such, having arisen at dawn, with a mind of sympathy towards all beings, with a mind of compassion, with a mind of friendliness, free from envy, pride, jealous disparagement and anger, with a one-pointed mind, having performed the higher pūjā of the Buddha, having honored all the Tathāgatas in the ten directions, having fixed in mind the courses [of events] according to [his] desire, having intoned a hundred and eight times [the mantrapada], each time a flower is to be given to the Tathāgata. From that there will be fulfilment of all his hopes; and in a dream there will be a vision of the Tathāgata(s); which excellent thing he desires, that he obtains; and at the moment of death there will be a vision of the Tathāgata(s); having passed away, he will be reborn in the world-sphere Sukhāvatī, [and be] possessed of long life, power, color and vigour; all [his] enemies will come into his power.

The mantrapada:

namaḥ sarvatathāgatānāṃ sarvāśāparipūrakaraṇāṃ / nama āryāvalokiteśvarasya bodhisattvasya mahākāruṇikasya / tadyathā

ha ha ha ha / mama mama / dhiri dhiri / śānte praśānte sarvapāpakṣayaṃkare / avalokaya kāruṇika bodhicittaṃ manasikuru / vyavalokaya māṃ smara smara yat tvayā pūrvaṃ satyādhiṣṭhānaṃ kṛtam / tena satyena sarvāśāṃ me paripūraya / buddhakṣetraṃ pariśodhaya / mā me kaścid viheṭhaṃ karotu / buddhādhiṣṭhānena svāhā / tadyathā

teje teje mahāteje / yan mama kāyaduścaritaṃ vāgduścaritaṃ manoduścaritaṃ dāridryaṃ vā tan me kṣapaya / ālokaya vilokaya /

tathāgatadarśanaṃ cāhaṃ abhikāṃkṣāmi bodhisattvadarśanam / dhudhupa dadasva me darśanam / sarve me kuśalā abhivardhantu / namaḥ sarvatathāgatānām / namaḥ avalokiteśvarasya / smara pratijñā mahāsattva / sidhyantu mantrapadāḥ svāhā /

Homage to all Tathāgatas, the fulfillers of all hopes! Homage to Avalokiteśvara, the Bodhisattva, the Greatly Compassionate One! To wit:

Indeed, Indeed, Indeed, Indeed. For me, for me. dhiri dhiri. O Tranquil, O Very Tranquil, O Exhauster of all Evil! Look down, O Compassionate One! Fix in mind the thought of awakening! Look all around! Remember me; remember that by you formerly an act of truth was made! Through this truth fulfil all of my hopes! Purify the buddhafield! May nothing do harm to me! Through the empowerment of the Buddha, all hail! To wit:

O Splendor, Splendor, O Great Splendor. Which of me is the misconduct of body or speech or mind or poverty - cause that to be exhausted for me! Look! Look upon [me]! I desire a vision of the Tathāgatas, a vision of the bodhisattvas - present(?), give me (such) a vision! May all my merit increase more and more! Homage to all Tathāgatas! Homage to Avalokiteśvara! Remember your promise, O Mahāsattva! May these mantrapadas succeed! All hail!

StA: GMs i 67.19-70.8; Ms. no. 30 (= A), fol. 1780.2-1785.3; Ms. no. 35 (= B), fol. 1825R.7-1834.7; Pek.vol. 27, 275-1-8 to 5-2

avalokiteśvara āha: yaḥ kaścit kulaputra imāṃ guṇāṃ abhikāṃkṣed yathā tathāgatena parikīrtitāṃ, [1)]vyākaraṇam abhikāṃkṣed[(1] mamāpi sammukhadarśanaṃ samādhilambhaṃ buddhabodhisatvadarśanaṃ bhogaiśvaryalambhaṃ buddhakṣetropapattiṃ, tena śuklapakṣe śucinā susnātagātreṇa bhūtvā āryāṣṭāṃgopavāsopavasitenāṣṭamyām ārabhya śucau pradeśe buddhādhiṣṭhite gandhapuṣpair dhvajapatākaiḥ pūrṇakumbhair abhyarcya [2)]taṃ pṛthivīpradeśaṃ taṃ ca dharmabhāṇakaṃ śuciṃ susnātagātraṃ śvetavastraprāvṛtaṃ[(2] nānāpuṣpamālyagandhair abhyarcya likhāpayitavyaḥ. sarvasatvasādhāraṇāni kuśalamūlāni kṛtvā sarvasatvamaitracittena dayācittena karuṇācittena tathāgatagurugauravaṃ cittam upasthāpya, tena dine dine likhatā[3] tāval likhe yāvad ardhadivasaṃ. aṣṭamyām ārabhya yāvat pañcadaśī dine dine saiva pūjā kartavyā . tato anenaiva vidhinā likhitamātreṇa paṃcānantaryāṇi karmāṇi sarvapāpāni cāsya kṣayaṃ yāsyanti, kuśalair dharmair[4] vivardhiṣyate,

uttaptavīryo bhaviṣyati, sarvadharmeṣu kāyasukham anuprāpsyati, tanvībhaviṣyaṃti rāgadveṣamohamānakrodhāḥ. Tena likhāpayitvā [5)]pūrvamukhī sadhātukī tathāgatapratimā avalokiteśvarapratimā ca sadhātukī[(5] sthāpya sadhātuke caityāyatane[6] puṣpadhūpagandhai dīpaiś ca udāratarā pūjā kartavyā. aṣṭamyām ārabhya yāvat pañcadaśī sarvasatvamahākaruṇācittena bhavitavyam śuciśuklabhojinā āryāṣṭāṃgopavāsopavasitena suhṛtsahāyakena mā[7]hokrodhamātsaryaparivarjitena dine dine udārataraṃ pūjā kṛtvā triṣandhyaṃ jāpo aṣṭaśatiko dātavyaḥ; dīpadhūpapuṣpagandhāni datvā sumanāpuṣpāṣṭaśatai(śca) āryāvalokiteśvarapratimā triṣandhyam āhantavyā[8]. vajrapāṇeś ca dhūpo dātavyaḥ; daśadiśaṃ abhinamaskṛtya paścimena bhīmāyā devyāḥ pūrveṇānopamāyāḥ ūrdhvena śaṃkhinyā bali(r) nānārasapāyasadadhyodanaṃ caturdiśaṃ kṣeptavyaḥ. tatas tasya na kaścid vikṣepa kariṣyati saṃtrāso, nānyathātvaṃ cittasya; sarveṣāṇāṃ ca aṣṭaśatiko jāpaḥ aṣṭaśatasumanāpuṣpaiś (ca) saṃcodanam[9]. [ane]naiva[10] vidhinā pūrvasecaṃ kṛtvā tataḥ pūrṇapaṃcadaśyāṃ catvāri pūrṇakumbhā sthāpya dhūpacandanakunduru-kakarpūran datvā dīpāś catvāri[11] nānāgandhadhvajapaṭapatākāsuvarṇarūpyabhāṇḍai taṃ[12] pṛthīvipradeśaṃ samalaṃkṛtya dadhimadhupāyasadadhyodanaṃ anyāni ca yathālābhena baliṃ caturdiśe datvā nivedya sumanāpuṣpāṣṭaśatair ekaikaṃ japya caturdiśe kṣeptavyaṃ pūrvavat tataḥ tr·aṣṭaśatai sumanājātipuṣpair ekaikaṃ japya āryāvalokiteśvarapratimā-r-āhantavya[13]. tataḥ sā pratimā kampiṣyati, mahānirghoṣo bhaviṣyati, raśmayo niścariṣyaṃti, pṛthivīkampaḥ[14]. tataḥ sarvakarmāṇi sarvakāryāṇi cāsya samṛdhyiṣyaṃti, tathāgatadarśanaṃ bodhisatvabhūmipratilaṃbhaḥ sarvasatvavandanīyo bhaviṣyati, dhanadhānyakośakoṣṭhāgārasamṛddhaḥ sarvavyādhiparivarjita cirajīvī [15)]sarvaśatravaḥ sarvarājarājaputrāmātyā [tasya] darśanābhikāṃkṣiṇo bhaviṣyaṃti kiṃkarāḥ sarvakleśarāgadveṣamohaprahīṇāḥ[(15]; na ca jātu priyaviprayogaṃ bhaviṣyati; mahādṛdhabalavīryasaṃpannaḥ tejavāṃ tīkṣṇendriya buddhimāṃ sarvasatvadayācitta dharmajño[16] yāvaś cyavanakāle buddhaṃ bhagavantaṃ āryāvalokiteśvaraṃ paśyati, maitravihārī kālaṃ karoti dharman deśayamānaṃ; yathepsiteṣu buddhakṣetreṣu mahācakravartikuleṣu yatrānusmṛtiṃ karoti tatropapadyate; anyāni cānekāni guṇasahasrāṇi pratilapsyate.

1)(1 A: vy(ā)karaṇam (xx)ma kāṃkse (this is written between the lines and is not very clear; whether that marked (xx) is the remains of two akṣaras or just smudge marks is impossible to tell); B: vyākaraṇam abhikāmxx... T: (... gaṅ la la ji ltar de bźin gśegs pas

yoṅs su bsgrubs pas yon tan de dag mṅon par 'dod ciṅ) luṅ bstan pa daṅ / (kho bo yaṅ mṅon sum du mthoṅ ba daṅ ...); Dutt gives vyākaraṇam mama kāṃkṣa[te], but it is unlikely that Avalokiteśvara was thought of as able to give predictions. [2)(2]A: sa pṛthivīpradeśoḥ sa ca dharmabhāṇako śuci susnātagātro śvetavastraprāvṛtaḥ; B: sa pṛthivīpradeśo sa ca dharmaxx...xxci susnātagātro śvetavastraprāxx.... T: sa phyogs de daṅ chos smra ba de la yaṅ mchod pa byas nas / lus legs par khrus byas pa gtsaṅ mas gos dkar po bgos te / me tog daṅ / bdug spos daṅ spos daṅ / me tog phreṅ ba daṅ / byug pa sna tshogs dag gis mchod nas. Both T (although it differs in some ways from the Skt) and the context indicate that sa pṛthivīpradeśo, etc., is the object of the following abhyarcya; we therefore have to take the string of nominatives as a case of nom. used for acc., or we must take it as a scribal error and emend. We have done the latter although other Gilgit texts show a clear tendency toward the use of nom. for acc.; cf. intro. to the ed.; a more definite grammatical statement must wait for a critical edition of *StA*. [3)]Both Mss. have likhatā but T: bri bar bya'o suggests something like likhāpayitavya and the pattern (inst. agent) + ger. + ger. + (inst. agent) + fut.pass.part. is extremely common in exhortatory passages of this kind. [4)]B: kuśalamūlaixx...; T: dge ba'i rtsa ba rnams. [5)(5]A: pūrvamukhī sadhātukā, etc.; T: de bźin gśegs pa'i sku gzugs sku gduṅ daṅ bcas pa daṅ / spyan ras gzigs dbaṅ phyug gi sku gzugs sku gduṅ daṅ bcas pa źal śar phyogs su bstan te bźag la; once again nominatives (here in -ī) functioning as accusatives (the -ā endings could be taken formally as either nom. or acc.). [6)]Dutt gives caitāyatane, which may be a printer's error; but this form is also listed in the index which gives the impression that it is a legitimate variant of the word caitya. A clearly has caityā-; B: caixx.. [7)]There is a gap in B beginning after mā-. [8)]T here gives gtor bar bya'o as the equivalent for āhantavyā. [9)]T: bskul bar bya'o, suggesting with the context, a fut.pass.part. [10)]ane- is not found in the Ms. but must certainly be supplied; cf. T: cho ga 'di kho na, and GMs i 68.9: tato 'nenaiva vidhinā. [11)]T: mar me kha bźi. [12)]A: sa; cf. n.2 above. [13)]T in the Pek. ed. here gives yet another equivalent for āhantavya: bstan par bya'o but Derge: bsnun par bya'o; cf. above n.8. [14)]T: sa yaṅ g.yo bar 'gyur ro / [15)(15]A: sarvaśatravā sarvarājārājaputrāmatyadarśanābhikāṃkṣiṇā bhaviṣyaṃti • kiṃkarāḥ sarvakleśarāgadveṣamoha-

prahīṇāḥ; T: dgra thams cad daṅ / rgyal po daṅ / rgyal bu daṅ / blon po rnams kyaṅ de la lta 'dod ciṅ gces smras byed par yaṅ 'gyur /.

16) T: chog śes pa daṅ.

Avalokiteśvara said: 'Whatever son of good family would desire these qualities as they were declared by the Tathāgata, would desire a prediction, a face-to-face vision of me, the obtainment of samādhis, a vision of the Buddhas and bodhisattvas, the obtainment of possessions and overlordship, rebirth in a buddhafield, by him during a bright fortnight, being pure and with well-bathed limbs, having fasted the worthy eight limbed fast, beginning on the eighth day on a pure spot empowered by the Buddha, with perfumes and flowers, with flags and banners, with full jars having worshipped, that spot of earth and that pure reciter of Dharma having well-bathed limbs and covered with white garments, with various flowers and garlands and perfumes having worshipped, [it; i.e. this sūtra or the dhāraṇī[1]] is to be caused to be written. Having made the [resulting] root of merit common to all beings, with a thought of friendliness towards all beings, with a thought of sympathy, with a thought of compassion, having established a thought of respect due to a guru towards the Tathāgata, by him day after day it is [to be] written; so long he would write it, down to [only] half a day. Beginning on the eighth day, up to the fifteenth, day after day just that pūjā is to be performed. Then through just this rite, through it being merely written, the five acts having immediate retribution and all evil [done] by him will be exhausted; there will be an increase in meritorious dharma, he will glow with vigour; in all situations he will obtain bodily ease; passion, hatred, delusion, pride and anger will be attenuated. By him after having had it written, having set up facing east an image of the Tathāgata having a relic, and an image of Avalokiteśvara having a relic, on the site of a caitya having a relic, with flowers, incense and perfume, and with lamps, the higher pūjā is to be performed. Beginning on the eighth day, up to the fifteenth, a thought of great compassion towards all beings is to be developed; by one having eaten [only] pure and clean food, having fasted the worthy eight-limbed fast, with a friend or companion, having renounced pride, anger and envy, day after day having done the higher pūjā, morning, noon and night the one hundred and eight intoning [of the mantrapadas] is to be given; having given

lamps, incense, flowers and perfumes, with one hundred and eight sumanā (T: sna ma) flowers, the image of Avalokiteśvara is to be smote[2] morning, noon and night, and incense is to be given to Vajrapāṇi. Having bowed to the ten directions - in the West to the Devī Bhīma[3], in the East to Anopamā[4], in the upper region to Śaṃkhinī[5] - an offering of pāyasa and dadhyodana having various flavors to the four directions is to be scattered. Then of him there will not be any distraction, fear, no mental fluctuation; and for all the one hundred and eight intoning, with one hundred and eight sumanā flowers is [to be] urged. Through just this rite having performed the first sprinkling, then on the fifteenth, the day of the full moon, having set up four full jars, having given incense, sandal wood, olibanum, and camphor [and] four lamps, with various perfumes, flags, painted clothes, banners, gold, silver and ornaments having fully adorned that spot of earth, having given, having offered to the four directions dadhi, madhu, pāyasa, and dadhyodana, or other food offerings in accordance with his means, having intoned [the mantrapadas] every single time with one hundred and eight sumanā flowers, they are to be thrown to the four directions as before. Then having intoned every single time with three times one hundred and eight sumanā flowers, the image of the worthy Avalokiteśvara is to be smote. Then that image will tremble, there will be a great noise, rays of light will shoot forth, [and there will be] a shaking of the earth. Then all his acts and all his duties will be successful; he will become one having a vision of the Tathāgatas, obtaining the stage of the bodhisatvas, to be honored by all beings, having abundant wealth, grain, treasuries and stores, having thrown off all disease, long-lived; all [his] enemies, all kings, the sons of kings and ministers will come to desire a sight of him, will be [his] servants having abandoned all the impurities, passion, hatred and delusion; he will never be separated from that which is dear to him, [he will be] possessed of great firmness, strength and vigour, possessed of brilliance, having sharp faculties, possessed of intelligence, having a thought of sympathy towards all beings, one knowing Dharma, up to: at the moment of dying he sees the Buddha, the Blessed One, [and] the Worthy Avalokiteśvara; he dies dwelling in friendliness and reciting dharma; in buddhafields (or) families of great cakravartins in accordance with his wishes, wherever he

fixes his recollection, there he is reborn. [These] and many other thousands of qualities he will obtain.

[1] The text here is strangely elliptical, leaving the object of likhāpayitavya to be understood. I have supplied an object on the basis of the sentence which immediately follows the passage I have quoted: evaṃ bhagavaṃ bahuguṇakaro 'yaṃ dharmaparyāya imāni ta [rd: ca] dhāraṇīmantrapadāni. [2] āhantavya appears to be an expression for what in texts like the *Ādikarmapradīpa* is called tāḍanavidhi; cf. L. de la Vallée Poussin, *Bouddhisme, études et matériaux* (London: 1898) 193; 218-20. There are, as indicated above, several Tibetan equivalents: gtor bar bya, bstan par bya, bsnun par bya. [3] Bhīmā herself presents her own 'dhāraṇī' and ritual at *StA* 75.7. [4] For the 'dhāraṇī' and ritual given by Anopamā see *StA* 71.1. [5] The 'dhāraṇī' and ritual given by Śaṃkhinī occur at *StA* 74.4.

The next ritual from *StA* is also connected with a pratijñā, here made by the mahāyakṣiṇī Anopamā; cf. *StA* 71.1f.

GMs i 72.3-73.6; Ms. no. 30, fol. 1788.3-1790.4; Ms. no. 35, fol. 1835L.1-1835R.3; Pek. vol. 27, 276-2-1 to 3-5.

[1] yaḥ kaścid bhagavaṃ guṇārthī dhanadhānyārthī sarvasatvavaśīkaraṇārthī bhave mahā[dha[2]]naiśvaryaṃ rājyatvaṃ vidyādharatvaṃ abhikāṃkṣe mamāpi sammukhadarśanaṃ, tena aṣṭamyāṃ śuklapakṣe nave paṭake acchinnadaśe keśāpagate sucinā citrakāreṇa āryāṣṭāṃgopavāsopavāsitena aślesai raṃgair navabhājanai sthai citrāpayitavyaṃ madhye tathāgatapratimā dharman deśayamānā, dakṣiṇenāryavajrakrodho vajraṃ bhrāmayamānaḥ sarvālaṅkāravibhūṣitaḥ [puṣpa[3]]mālārdhacandrahāraḥ śvetavastraprāvṛtaḥ, vāmapārśve anopamā śarakāṇḍagaurī sarvālaṃkāravibhūṣitā śvetavastrā padmahastā samāśvāsayaṃtī[4]. tataḥ śucinā vidyādhareṇa āryāṣṭāṃgopavasitena śucau sadhātuke tathāgatasthāne kṣīrayāvakāhāreṇa śvetavastraprāvṛtenātmadvitīyena[5] aṣṭamyāṃ pūrvasecaṃ kṛtvā nānāpuṣpagandhadhūpadīpaiḥ pūjāṃ kṛtvā tṛṣkṛtvā tṛ-aṣṭaśatiko jāpo dātavyaḥ; ekaikaṃ sumanāpuṣpaṃ japya tri-aṣṭaśataiḥ sā pratimā āhantavyā[6]; tathāgatasya vajrapāṇeś ca pūrvataraṃ puṣpadhūpagandhaṃ dātavyaṃ, balipāyasadadhyodanaṃ nānārasaṃ[7] nānāmadyaṃ caturdiśe kṣeptavyaṃ; pūrṇapaṃcadaśyāṃ anenaiva vidhinā baliṃ anyāṃs ca yathālābhena dhūpakarpūrakundurukacandanaṃ mrakṣaṃ[8]

dātavyaṃ sugandhatailena dvau dīpau dātavyau. tatrāhaṃ svarūpeṇopatiṣṭhiṣyāmi, yathepsitaṃ varaṃ dāsyāmi samādhilābham ākāśagamanam antardhānaṃ rājyatvaṃ balacakravartitvaṃ vidyādharatvaṃ nidhivādaṃ[9] dhātuvādaṃ paracittajñānaṃ dīrghāyuṣkatvaṃ, sarvasatvānāṃ maitracittena bhavitavyaṃ, etc.

[1)]Almost three fourths of this passage is missing in B; see below n.7. [2)]Ms omits -dha-, but cf T: nor gyi dbaṅ phyug chen po daṅ /. [3)]T: me togs phreṅ ba daṅ / zla gam daṅ / se mo dos brgyan pa. [4)]T: sug pa na pad ma thogs śiṅ yaṅ dag par dbugs 'byin pa'i tshul du mchis pa bri bar bgyi'o. [5)]T: grogs daṅ ldan pa. [6)]Again R in the Pek. ed. has bstan par bgyi'o, but in the Derge ed. bsnun par bgyi. [7)]Ms. B starts here. [8)]I have followed Dutt in reading mrakṣam; A has smṛkṣam or spṛkṣam; B: ..xx(kṣ)ān; T śiṅ mu sa dag, which I do not understand, although it is probably the name of a plant. [9)]T (Pek.) de lta 'tshal ba, (Derge) gter la 'tshal ba.

Whosoever would come to be desirous of qualities, of possessions and grains, of subjugating all beings, would desire great possessions and lordship, sovereignty, the status of a vidyādhara, a face-to-face vision of me, by him on the eighth day of the bright fortnight, on a new piece of cotton[1] with its fringes uncut[2] and free of nap[3], he is to have painted by a pure painter who has fasted the worthy eight-limbed fast, with unmixed colors[4] placed in new pots, [the following:] in the middle an image of the Tathāgata teaching Dharma; on the right, the Worthy Vajrakrodha brandishing a vajra, adorned with all ornaments, having a necklace of half-moons and a garland of flowers, covered with white garments; on the left side Anopamā, white as the stem of śara grass, adorned with all ornaments, having white garments, having a lotus in [her] hand, [and in the aspect of] giving confidence. Then by a pure officiant[5] having fasted the worthy eight-limbed fast, at a pure place [devoted to] the Tathāgata and possessed of a relic, having eaten milk and barley, being covered with white garments, together with a second, having performed the first sprinkling on the eighth day, with various flowers, perfumes, incenses and lamps having done pūjā, three times the three times onde hundred and eight intoning [of the mantrapadas] is to be given; having intoned over one after another sumanā flower , with three times one hundred and eight, that image is to be smote. To the

Tathāgatha and to Vajrapāṇi the very first flowers, incense and perfumes are to be given, [then] an offering of pāyasa and dadhyodana having various flavors, [and] various drinks in the four directions is to be scattered. On the fifteenth, the day of the full moon, through just this rite an offering and other things such as ground incense, camphor, olibanum and sandal wood, in accordance with his means, are to be given; two lamps with sweet smelling oil are to be given. I there in my actual form will come to stand; I will give excellent things as they are desired: the obtainment of samādhis, [the ability of] travelling through the air, invisibility, sovereignty, the state of a powerful cakravartin, the status of vidyādhara, the ability to locate treasures, the art of alchemy, knowledge of others thoughts, longevity; and he is to become one having thoughts of friendliness towards all beings, etc.

1) The ritual described here connected with the paṭa has much in common with those from the *Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa* which have been studied by Lalou, *Iconographie des étoffes peintes (Paṭa) dans le Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa* (paris: 1930). The importance of the passage in *StA* for the history of the development of this ritual lies in the fact that it describes a form of the rite which is much less elaborate, and probably earlier, than those found in the *Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa*.
2) Lalou, p.61: "dont la frange n'a pas été coupée". 3) Lalou, p.53 and n.2: "rase". 4) Lalou, p.30: "des couleurs franches".
5) vidyādhara translated here after Lalou, p.24 "l'officiant".

A final text from *StA* is:

StA: GMs i 80.15-22; Ms. no. 30, fol.1805.3-1806.3; Ms. no. 35 deest; Pek. vol. 27, 278-2-4 to 2-8

tasmāt tarhi taiḥ kulaputraiḥ kuladuhitṛbhir vā sarvāpāyair ātmānam parimoktukāmena satkṛtya ayaṃ dharmaparyāyaḥ pūjayitavyo 1) dhārayitavyaḥ satkartavyaḥ (1 parebhyaḥ saṃprakāśayitavyaḥ manasā dhārayitavyaḥ 2) ḍimbaḍamaraduḥsvapnadurnimitteṣu akālamṛtyugomara-paśumara[mānuṣamara]rebhyo nānāvyādhibhayopadravebhya (2 imaṃ dharma-paryāyam pūjayitvā vācayitavyaḥ dhvaje vā ucchrepitaṃ kṛtvā pūjayitvā nānāgandhapuṣpadhūpavādyaiḥ praveṣṭavyaḥ 3 caturdiśe balin datvābhina-maskṛtya puṣpadhūpagandhaiḥ sarva ity upadravāḥ praśamaṃ yāsyanti.

1)(1T omits dhārayitavyaḥ satkartavyaḥ. 2)(2T gives this phrase in a form which differs somewhat in both grammar and vocabulary: khrug khrug daṅ / 'khrug sloṅ daṅ / rmi lam ṅan pa daṅ / ltas ṅan pa daṅ / dus ma yin par 'chi ba daṅ / gnag nad daṅ / phyugs nad daṅ / mi nad dag daṅ nad daṅ 'jigs pa daṅ / gnod pa sna tshogs dag la ... 3)T: 'jug par byas na.

Therefore, in that case, by those sons and daughters of good family, through the desire to free themselves from all unfortunate rebirths, having done honor, this discourse on Dharma is to be worshipped ... to be illuminated for others, to be preserved in mind; [by those desiring to be freed] from brawls, wrangles, bad dreams, and ill omens, from untimely deaths, death through cattle, death through beasts, and death through men, from the many diseases, fears and disasters, having worshipped this discourse on Dharma, it is to be recited or, having raised it on a banner, having worshipped it with various perfumes, flowers, incenses and music, it is to be brought forth (i.e. in procession ?); having given an offering to the four directions, having done homage with flowers, incenses and perfumes, all disasters will come to be allayed.

[For further examples of liturgical texts in *StA* see 58.11-13; 74.17-75.3; and 76.11-77.13].

Rkp 40.11-41.1; GMs iv 41.1-9; GBMs vi 1197.2-5; Pek. 187-5-3 [text cited above p.217]

Wherever in a village or city or town there could be [fatal] harm or an untimely death of humans or non-humans or four footed creatures who are afflicted with disease, there this book of the *Ratnaketudhāraṇī* with the requisites for great pūjā is to be brought forth. Having been brought forth, by one being well bathed, having his limbs well annointed, being dressed in new clothes, being continent, having mounted a lion-throne strewn with various flowers, perfumed with various scents, covered with various pastes, this book of the *Ratnaketudhāraṇī* then is to be read out. There all sicknesses and untimely deaths will be allayed. And there all fears and terrors and ill omens will disappear.

Rkp 137.5-138.7; GMs iv 118.7-119.10; GBMs vii 1261.3-1262.4 [text cited above p. 218]

Whatever son or daughter of good family, or bhikṣu or bhikṣuṇī, or lay man or woman having bathed, having put on clean clothes, in a circular hall strewn with various flowers, perfumed with various scents, covered with various pastes, formed with various clothes and ornaments and fine cotton, well decorated with umbrellas and flags and banners raised aloft, having mounted a lion throne which is soft and comfortable to the touch, would 'recite' this dhāraṇī— of him nothing can cause a disturbance of thought or disturbance of body or disturbance of mind; nothing can deprive his body of breath; etc.

ŚmD 100.12-16; GBMs vii 1326.3-5; Lhasa vol. 61, 199-1-1 to 1-4

yaḥ kaścid dhārayiṣyati vācayiṣyati[1] imāni tathāgatanāmāni kalyam[2] utthāya śucinā[3] sarvabuddhānāṃ puṣpadhūpaṃ datvā śriyai[4] mahādevyai candanadhūpaṃ datvā vācayitavyāni, sarvaśrīm[5] adhigamiṣyati sarvasukhasaumanasyalābhī bhaviṣyati sarvadevatāś ca rakṣāvaraṇaguptiṃ kariṣyanti sarvakāryasiddhis tasya bhaviṣyati.

1) Banerji has omitted vācayiṣyati. 2) Ms.: kālyam; T: naṅ par (laṅs) te. 3) Ms.: śucināṃ; Banerji śucinā; T: gtsaṅ mar byas la / 4) Ms.: śriyair. 5) Banerji -śriyam.

Whosoever will preserve, will recite these names of the Tathāgatas (i.e. those listed at *ŚmD* 96.1f), having risen at dawn, with purity having given flowers and incense to all Buddhas, having given incense of sandal wood to Śrī Mahādevī, [those names] are to be recited. [Then] he will realize all good fortune, he will obtain all ease and peace of mind, and all the devatās will guard, shelter and protect him; there will be success for all his undertakings.

Once again, I think it is possible to make a number of preliminary remarks concerning these passages and the rituals they describe.

1) They indicate that the Buddhism of Gilgit had available to it a rich supply of liturgical texts to structure its ritual activity. That the rituals of *StA* were actually practised at Gilgit is almost certain from the fact that the personal names of the sponsors of the

ritual or manuscript have been inserted into the mantrapadas in one of the two Mss. of *StA* (no. 30) recovered from Gilgit (cf. GMs i 56.5, 58.3, etc.). And there is no good reason for not assuming that the other rituals described in other texts - which are, it should be noted, much less elaborate - were not also actually performed. They also indicate that the ritual forms current or available at Gilgit were entirely non-tantric in character: they are all public acts; they may be undertaken by anyone, monk or laymen; they require no initiation, nor the instruction of any guru; and their intention is wholly exoteric.

2) There appear to be a number of different features by which the various rituals can be classified. They can be classified according to whether or not they are performed for oneself (*Rkp* 137.5, *ŚmD*, *StA*, *Bhg* [14]), or performed for another (*Rkp* 40.11, *Bbp*, *Bhg* [18]). They can be classified according to their position vis-à-vis the fear of death: there are those for which death is already present and which are undertaken to allay the fears associated with the inevitable karmatic consequences of death, or rebirth (*Bhg* [18], *Bbp*). There are those which are undertaken to cope with fears associated with imminent, usually 'untimely' death, and those undertaken to cope with fears connected with the want of materials things - poverty, hunger, subjugation - on account of which the threat of death and the possibility for unmeritorious action are greatly increased (*Bhg* [14], *Rkp* 40.11, 137.5, *StA*, etc.). The last two are very often times found lumped together, as at *Bhg* [14], but both can occur separately.

3) All are undertaken on the basis of a prior assurance of their karmatic efficacy. The assurance is given in the form of a praṇidhāna (*Bhg*, *Bbp*), a pratijñā (*StA*), or a statement on the part of the giver of the ritual. This is particularly important in regard to *StA* because the rituals it describes, when taken in isolation, can appear to be of a different character from those of *Bhg* and *Bbp*; but in the same way that the rituals of *Bhg* and *Bbp* are undertaken to bring into effect the vows of Bhaiṣajyaguru, Amitābha, etc., so the rituals of *StA* are undertaken to bring into effect the pratijñās of Avalokita, Vajrapāṇi, etc. And if it is accepted that when the conditions of a vow or pratijñā are fulfilled, it becomes a kind of natural - karmatic - law, then there is conceptually nothing at all 'magical' involved.

4) In all these rituals the verbal component is central. This verbal component is represented by the 'recitation' of texts (*Bhg*, *Bbp*, *Rkp* 40.11); the 'recitation' of the name or names of one or more Buddhas (*Bhg*, *Bbp*, *ŚmD*), or the recitation of a 'dhāraṇī' (*StA*, *Rkp* 137.5). This once again underlines the functional interchangeability, and therefore equivalence, of texts, Buddhas' names, and *this kind of dhāraṇī*. All belong in a single category. It is also worth noting that this centrality of the verbal component appears to be a constant in Buddhist ritual of all periods (cf. S.J. Tambiah, *Buddhism and the Spirit Cults in North-east Thailand* (Cambridge: 1970) 195-222; R.B. Ekvall, *Religious Observances in Tibet: Patterns and Function* (Chicago: 1969) 98-149; etc.).

5) Almost all of these rituals - especially those described in comparatively greater detail - share a certain number of common features: (a) There is an insistence on adequate preparation, either the undertaking of the Upoṣadha fast (*Bhg* [14], [18], *StA* 67.19, 72.3), or the eightfold path (*Bbp*), or remaining continent (*Rkp* 40.11). (b) The need for a certain state of mind is specified; one is to undertake the ritual after having produced thoughts of friendliness, compassion, etc., toward all beings (*Bhg* [14], *Bbp*, *StA* 56.11, 67.19). (c) The necessity of physical cleanliness is repeatedly mentioned (*Bhg* [14], *StA* 67.19, 72.3, *Rkp* 40.11, 137.5). (d) There is a decided emphasis put on the need for the ritual preparation of the site (*Bhg* [14], *StA* 67.19, *Rkp* 40.11, *Rkp* 137.5). (e) And most indicate a specific time on or during which the ritual is to take place. All of these common features are in fact preliminary to the ritual itself, and the fact that so much emphasis is placed on these preliminaries is in itself significant. They indicate above all the necessity of firmly establishing the religious, formal, 'sacred' character of the act which is about to be undertaken, and the emphasis on mental preparation is unmistakable. This, of course, accords very well with the primacy given to the mental component in all Buddhist discussions of behaviour or karmatic acts.

If the preliminaries exhibit a common structure, this is equally true of the rituals themselves. Here the basic structure is fairly simple. It involves, as I have said, a verbal component, the recitation of a text, a dhāraṇī, or a Buddha's name, in conjunction with activity directed towards an image, a book, or a Buddha or Bodhisattva who may or may not be physi-

cally represented (e.g. *ŚmD*). The activity consists above all of giving 'gifts' - flowers, perfume, incense, etc. - or of circumambulation, obeisance, etc. This again is the basic structure and it is common to all these rituals. And, again, this is especially important in reference to *StA* since the rituals there described are *in detail* more elaborate - there is reference to food-offerings made to the four directions, 'sprinkling', etc. - but when these rituals are compared with those in *Bhg*, *Bbp*, *Rkp*, etc., it is clear that these details do not affect the basic structure nor alter the fundamental character of acts involved. This, of course, is underscored by the fact that the conceptual framework which underlies the rituals of *StA* is, as I have indicated above, fundamentally the same as that which underlies the rituals of *Bhg*, *Bbp*, etc.

6) Finally, I think it is worth noting that in none of these rituals is there reference to the worship of stūpas. This tends to confirm what I have suggested elsewhere (*IIJ* 17 (1975) 180-81), that *the stūpa cult was not a Mahāyāna form.* As a matter of fact there are only two texts at Gilgit which unqualifiedly advocate the worship of stūpas, *Mvk* and the *Adbhutadharmaparyāya*, both of which appear to be Hīnayāna texts. [This affiliation is especially interesting in terms of the *Adbhuta*, since this text was taken over and made into Ch. I of the **Anuttarāśrayasūtra*, an important Tathāgatagarbha sūtra (cf. J. Takasaki, "Structure of the Anuttarāśrayasūtra (Wu-shang-i-ching)", *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 16 (1960) 34). Takasaki's somewhat unrestrained speculations regarding the place of origin of the *Adbhuta* can, in light of its three Gilgit Mss., be laid to rest.] Apart from this there are only two definitely Mahāyāna texts at Gilgit which show any interest in the stūpa cult, *Bbp* and *SP*, and in both - if I am not mistaken - far from being advocated, the stūpa cult is considered at best as an inferior cult form (for *Bbp* see *JIP* 6 (1978) n.4; for *SP*, *IIJ* 17 (1975) 163-67, 180-81). I might also add that I have here only incidentally referred to the cult of the book. It is, however, as firmly established and pervasive in the literature from Gilgit as it is in Mahāyāna sūtra literature as a whole. I have not dealt with it at length because I have already written about it elsewhere, and because the Gilgit texts only confirm what I have already said without adding anything essentially new.

* * * * *

b. Regardless of the criteria one might choose to use it seems that the passages studied above represent the dominant and most firmly established view of pūjā available at Gilgit. It is not, however, the only view. One text in particular, *SR*, devotes a surprizing amount of space to developing other views. I think it is worthwhile to study these other views in *SR* in some detail because they indicate better than anything else I know the differences between what I have called karmatic and Bodhic Buddhism. I will first give the relevant passages - some of which are quite long - arranged into four separate groups; and then add what comments seem necessary.

Group I.

The whole of Chapter V is in form a pūrvayoga put in the mouth of the Buddha Śākyamuni. It is clear from Matsunami's edition of the Nepalese redaction that there are significant differences between it and the Gilgit text. Since Dutt in his edition has in almost all the important passages accepted the readings of the Nepalese Mss rather than those of the Gilgit text, it seemed advisable to cite the whole of the latter as it occurs in the Ms. The Ms here is not, however, perfectly preserved. I have occasionally attempted to restore the missing portions on the basis of the Nepalese redaction and Tibetan, but only when the restoration appeared relatively certain. I have also often only indicated that a certain spot in the Gilgit Ms was damaged. In a number of cases the nature at least of the missing portion is fairly easy to surmise since it occurs in the middle of long lists of similar or related things: and in spite of the fragmentary nature of the text, enough survives to indicate clearly the nature of the argument as a whole, and to indicate that the argument in the Gilgit Ms was fuller and more detailed than that preserved in the Nepalese text.

I give below the text and translation of the most important passages together with a summary of the rest.

SR Ch. V: GBMs ix (=G) 2498.6-2507.1; GMs ii 55.8-66.16; TDK 61 (= N) 794.7-780.4; Pek. (= T) vol.31, no. 795, 278-4-7 to 280-1-6

[tena ca kumāra kālena tena sama]yena rājño mahābalasya vijite bhagavān ghoṣadatto nāma tathāgato rhan samyaksaṃbuddho utpanno bhūt

[hi kumāra rājñā mahābalena bhagavān ghoṣadatta]s tathāgato rhan samyaksaṃbuddha paripūrṇaṃ varṣasahasraṃ nimaṃtrito bhūt sārdhaṃ bodhisattvabhikṣusaṃghena [[1]kalpikena paribhogenānavadyena cīvara-piṇḍapātraśay]yāsanaglānapratyayabhaiṣajyapariṣkāreṇa. Tena ca kumāra kālena tena samayena tasya bhagavato ghoṣadatta[sya tathāgatasyārhataḥ samyaksaṃbuddhasya sabodhisattvasaṅ[2]]ghasyotsado [lābha(satk)āraśloka bhūt[3]. śrāddhāś[4] ca brāhmaṇagṛhapatayo bhagavato ghoṣadattasya tathāgatasyārhataḥ sa[myaksaṃbuddhasya sabodhisattvasaṅghasyotsadaṃ lābhasatkāra[5]]ślokam akārṣuḥ. te ca śrāddhā brāhmaṇagṛhapatayo ghoṣadattasya tathāgatasyārhataḥ samyaksaṃbuddhasya [lābhasa]tkārāyodyuktā a[bhūvan yaduta lokāmiṣapūjayā rājña eva ca ma]hābalasyā(nu)śikṣamāṇarūpā [6)]dānaparamā abhūvad dūrībhūtā p[r]atti-pattyāḥ yaduta śīlasamādānād upavā ... (at least 18 akṣaras missing) ... bhikṣubhāvāc ca tathāgatopasaṃkramaṇāc ca paryupāsana[ta]ś ca (paripṛ)cchanataś ca pari(pra)śnakara(ṇata)ś ca gaṃbhī ... (about 18 akṣaras missing) ... [bha]gavato[(6] ghoṣadattasya tathāgatasyārhataḥ samyaksaṃbuddhasyaitad abhavan [8)]parihīyante vateme satvāḥ śīla-poṣadhasa... (about 16 akṣaras) ...(pra)vrajyopasampado bhikṣubhāvāc ca tathāgatopasaṃkramaṇāc ca paryupāsanāc ca paripṛcchanataś ca paripra(śnakaraṇa)ta(ś) ... (about 16 akṣaras missing) ... nāc ca. Tathārū(pā) sukhopadhānāt parihīṇā; tadantara[ṃ] sukhopadhānapari-śuddhāḥ yaduta lokāmiṣa(pūjay]āḥ te a... (about 16 akṣaras missing) ... [f 2500] [tatka]sya hetoḥ tathāpi sukham idaṃ yaduta lokāmiṣa-pūjayā. te ete satvā dṛṣṭadharmagurukāś ca saṃparāyagurukāś ca ya[duta svargalokādyālambanatayā nātyantaniṣṭhāḥ ku[7]]śalamūlāya tatreyaṃ dṛṣṭadharmagurukatā . yaduta paṃcakāmaguṇābhiprāyatā. tatra katamā sāṃparāyikaguru... (about 18 akṣaras missing) ... katamā atyantaniṣṭhakuśalamūlagurukatā yadutātyantaviśuddhiḥ atyantavimuktir atyantayogakṣematā aty ... (about 18 akṣaras missing) ... niṣṭhā atyantaparinirvāṇam yat [t]v aham eteṣāṃ satvānāṃ tathā dharmaṃ deśayeya[ṃ] yad amī satvā tadā ... (about 18 akṣaras missing) ... [dharmapū]jayā dharmapratipattyā tathāgataṃ pūjayeyuḥ[(8]

1) This is an approximate reconstruction. Matsunami and T have bodhisattvasaṃghena bhikṣusaṃghena ca kalpikena, etc.; such a reading is too long for the gap in G. Besides, with the reading of G, bhikṣu-saṃghena ca would be redundant. One of Matsunami's Mss has only

sārdhaṃ bodhisattvasaṃghena kalpikena, etc. If bhikṣusaṃghena ca is set aside, the remaining text of N appears to fit the gap in G. [2]Here again the text of N and T is too long unless we omit there saśrāvakasaṅghasya ca. [3]N has lābhasatkāram akārṣuḥ, but this time T supports G: rñed pa daṅ bkur sti daṅ grags pa che bar gyur to. [4]G has chrāvakāś ca, but context and the occurrence of the same phrase a little further on shows this to be a mistake. [5]Again Matsunami's and T's saśrāvakasaṅghasya must be omitted for the text in N to fill the gap in G; it here is omitted in two of Matsunami's Mss. [6](6All of this is omitted in N and T. [7]This from N fits the gap perfectly in terms of space and matches perfectly with the syllables at the beginning and the end of the gap in G so I have ventured to insert it here. [8](8For the whole of this passage N and T are much shorter than G: parihīyante ca te me sattvāḥ śīlapoṣadhasamādānatas tathāgatānām upasaṃkramaṇatas tathāgataparyupāsanato brahmacaryavāsataḥ pravrajyāyā upasampado bhikṣubhāvataś ca. ete sattvās tadanantaraṃ sukhagurukāḥ. tatkasya hetoḥ tathā hi tadanantaraṃ sukham idaṃ yaduta lokāmiṣapūjayā, ete sattvā dṛṣṭadharmagurukāḥ saṃparāyagurukāś ca yaduta svargalokādyālambanatayā nātyantaniṣṭhāḥ kuśalamūlāya. tatra kumāra katamat tad atyantaniṣṭhaṃ kuśalamūlaṃ. yadutātyantaviśuddhiḥ atyantabrahmacaryāvāsaḥ atyantaparyavasānaṃ atyantaniṣṭhaṃ kuśalamūlaṃ. yat tv ahaṃ eteṣāṃ sattvānāṃ tathā dharmaṃ deśayeyaṃ yathānuttarayā dharmapūjayā dharmapratipattyā ca tathāgataṃ pūjayeyuḥ

[And, O Crown Prince, at that time, at that period], in the territory of the king Mahābala, a Blessed One named Ghoṣadatta, a Tathāgata, Arhat, Samyaksaṃbuddha, appeared. Just so [O Crown Prince, by that king Mahābala, the Blessed One Ghoṣadatta], the Tathāgata, Arhat, Samyaksaṃbuddha (N.B. hereafter these 3 epithets, which are constantly repeated in the text, are ignored), together with the community of bodhisattva-bhikṣus, was for a full thousand years presented [with suitable, with appropriate things], with the standard belongings (of a monk): [robes and alms-bowls and couches and] seats and medicines to cure the sick. And, O Crown Prince, at that time, at that period, there was for that Blessed One Ghoṣadatta together with the community of bodhisattvas an abundance of material

gain and honor and praise; and the believing brāhmaṇas and householders (also) effected [an abundance of material gain and honor] and praise for that Blessed One Ghoṣadatta [together with the community of bodhisattvas]. Those believing brāhmaṇas and householders were zealously active for [the material gain and honor] of Ghoṣadatta, [that is to say, through pūjā through things-of-this-world], and there was an excellence of giving having a form imitating king Mahābala, (but) truly far removed from (real) practice, that is to say, from undertaking morality ..... from becoming a monk, and from approaching the Tathāgatas, and from attending to and questioning and asking about profound (dharmas?) ..... (then) to the Blessed One Ghoṣadatta this thought occurred: 'Indeed these beings are deficient in [undertaking] morality and the Upoṣadha ..... in going forth, ordination and becoming a monk, in approaching the Tathāgatas, in attending to and questioning and asking about (deep dharmas?) ..... Being of such kind they are deficient in what is necessary for happiness; (they think) having purified what is necessary for happiness is different from that (i.e., from undertaking morality, becoming a monk, etc.), that is to say, (that it is) from pūjā through things-of-this-world ..... [f 2500] what is the reason for that ? Just thus (they think) 'This is happiness', that is to say, by pūjā through things-of-this-world. And these beings are those who are concerned with the here-and-now, and those concerned with the hereafter, that is [to say], through the fact of having the world of heaven, etc., as a basis, (they are) such as have a limited end for their] roots of merit. This then is the state of being concerned with the here-and-now, namely: the state of desiring the five qualities of sense pleasures. And what then is the state of being concerned with the hereafter ..... (and) what (on the other hand) is the state of being concerned with roots of merit having an unlimited end ? Namely: unlimited purification, unlimited release, the state of unlimited security ..... unlimited parinirvāṇa. Suppose now I, for those beings, should so teach dharma that those beings then ..... through pūjā through [dharma], through the practice of dharma, would do pūjā to the Tathāgatas.

At this point Ghoṣadatta recites a series of gāthās. I cite here those most relevant to the subject matter of the prose section just quoted:

lokāmiṣeṇo nara sevatāṃ nṛṇāṃ
    sa teṣa sāṃdṛṣṭiku bhoti arthaḥ
nirāmiṣaṃ dharmu niṣevatāṃ hi
    [mahāntu artho bhavatī narāṇāṃ] // 3 //

na kaści buddha(ḥ) purimeṇa āsīd
    anāgato bheṣyati[yo 'vatiṣṭhate
yehi sthitair evam agāramadhye]
    prāpta iyaṃ uttamam agrabodhim // 7 //

yo buddhavīrān yatha gaṃgavālikā
    upasthayyā bahukalpakoṭiyaḥ
yaś co [gṛhātaḥ] parikhinnamānaso
    'bhini[ṣkrameyyā ayu tatra uttamaḥ // 9 //

annehi] pānehi ca cīvarehi vā
    puṣpehi gandhehi vilepanehi vā
nopasthitā bhonti narottamā jinā
    yatha pravrajitvā ca[ramāṇa dharmaṃ // 10 //

yaś caiva bodhiṃ pratikāṅkṣamā]-[f 2502]-ṇa[ḥ]
    satvārtha nirviṇṇa kusaṃskṛtāto
raṇyāmukho saptapadāni prakrame
    ayaṃ tato puṇyu viśiṣṭu bhoti // 11 //

// 3 // Of those men honoring a man with things-of-the-world, that for them comes to be (only) an advantage connected with the present life. But for men who have recourse to dharma not of the world, [that comes to be a great advantage.]

// 7 // There was no Buddha whatsoever in the past, (nor) one that will be in the future [(or) one who is presently abiding, by whom dwelling thus in the household life] this most excellent, foremost awakening was obtained.

// 9 // Who would attend on Awakened Heroes as numerous as the sands of the Ganges for many koṭīs of kalpas; and who, having

a troubled mind,[from the household life][would go forth - this (latter) is the most excellent of the two.

// 10 // Through food] and drink, through robes or through flowers, through perfumes or through unguents, the Jinas, the most excellent of men, are not (truly) attended on as (they are by one, who) having gone forth, [is practising dharma.

// 11 // And just who, desiring awakening], for the sake of beings being disgusted with unsatisfactory conditioned things, facing towards the forest-life, would stride forth seven steps - this [latter] is a more excellent merit than the [first].

After these gāthās - vs. 11 is the last of the series - there follows another prose section, the contents of which may be summarized as follows: king Mahābala, having heard these verses thinks: "As I understand the meaning of that spoken by the Blessed One, the Blessed One does not praise the perfection of giving. That having an unlimited end the Blessed One fully praises; unlimited purification, etc." ([yathāhaṃ bhagavato bhāṣitasyā]rtham ājānāmi na bhagavān dānapāramitāṃ varṇayati, atyantaniṣṭhām bhagavān saṃvarṇayati, atyantaviśuddhim, etc.). He further reflects: "It is not easy for one dwelling in a house to accomplish the utmost practice of dharma or truly obtain it (nedaṃ sukara[m agāram adhyāvasatānuttarāṃ dharmapratipattiṃ saṃpāda]yitum arthato vānuprāptuṃ)". He then resolves to 'go forth', approaches Ghoṣadatta, obtains the *Samādhirāja*, shaves his hair and beard, etc., and 'goes forth'. After koṭis of kalpas of studying, developing, etc., the *Samādhirāja*, pleasing Buddhas, etc., he becomes a Buddha himself. The same series of events is then repeated in reference to the large group of beings who had approached Ghoṣadatta in the company of Mahābala. The chapter is then concluded with a gāthā version of the entire pūrvayoga. The core of this gāthā version is represented by the following verses:

mahābalasyo vijitasmi buddho
    utpanna so devamanu[ṣyapūjitaḥ

labhitva rājā sugatasmi śra]ddhām
upasthahi varṣasahasra pūrṇaṃ // 17 //

tasyānuśikṣī bahu anyi satvāḥ
kurvaṃti satkāru tathāgatasya
lokāmiṣeṇo na hi dha[rmapūjayā
saśrāvakasyā atulo 'bhu] utsadah // 18 //

abhūṣi cittaṃ puruṣottamasya
deśeṣyi dharmaṃ imi dharmakāmāḥ
ya[n] nūna sarve prajahitva kāmān
iha pravraje[yur mama śāsanasmin // 19 //

sa bhāṣate gātha] narāṇam uttama
saṃlekhadharmaṃ sugatāna śikṣāṃ
gṛhavāsadoṣāś ca anantaduḥkhā
pratipatti dharmeṣv aya dharmapūjā // 20 //

[śruṇitva gāthāṃ tada rāja pārthivo
eko vicinte]ti rahogato nṛpaḥ
na śakyu gehasmi sthihitva sarvā
pratipadyituṃ uttamadharmapūjāḥ // 21 //

sa rāju tyaktvā yatha kheṭapiṇḍaṃ, etc.

// 17 // A Buddha appeared in the territory of Mahābala; he was [worshipped] by devas and men. [The king, having obtained] faith [in the Sugata], attended on him for a full thousand years.

// 18 // Many other beings imitating him did honor to the Tathāgata through things-of-this-world, but not [through pūjā-through-dharma. And there was (also) an immeasurable] abundance [for his śrāvakas.]

// 19 // (Then) a thought occurred to the Best-of-men: 'Suppose now I would teach dharma to those desirous of dharma (so that) they all, having given up desires, would here go forth [in my teaching.]

// 20 // [He], the Most Excellent of Men, [spoke these gāthās;] 'An austere dharma is the teaching of the Sugatas; and the defects of dwelling in a household are an endless suffering. Practice in dharmas - this is pūjā-through-dharma.'

// 21 // [Having heard (these) gāthās, then the king, the lord of the earth,] the protector of men, in private, [alone, reflected (thus:)] 'It is not possible for all (those) having remained in a household to accomplish the most excellent pūjā-through-dharma'.

// 22 // He (the king) having renounced his kingdom as (if it were) a wad of spit, etc., etc.

Shorter passages of this type are:

SR XXIV 29-30: GBMs ix 2620.7-8; GMs ii 318.7-10; Pek. vol. 31, 308-3-6 = 3-8 (as a part of a larger description of the decline during 'the last time' the Buddha is made to say):

śikṣā'vadātavastrāṇāṃ gṛhiṇāṃ yā mi dāśitā
sā śikṣā teṣāṃ bhikṣūṇāṃ tasmin kāle na bheṣyati // 29 //
bherīśaṃkhamṛdaṃgehi pūjāṃ kāhenti te mama
yā ca sā uttamā pūjā pratipattir na bheṣyati // 30 //

// 29 // The discipline for the white-robed householders which was taught by me, (even) that discipline in the last time will not be undertaken by monks, (instead).
// 30 // With kettle-drums, conches and tambours they will perform pūjā to me, but that which is the most excellent pūjā, practice, will not be.

SR XXXV 3-5: GBMs ix 2722.5-2723.1; GMs iii 494.1-12:

buddhāna koṭīnayutāny upasthihed
annena pānena prasannacittaḥ
chatraiḥ paṭākābhi dīpakriyābhi
kalpāna koṭī yatha gaṅgavālikā // 3 //

yaś caiva saddharma pralujyamāne
    nirudhyamāne sugatāna śāsane
rātrindivaṃ eka [ca]reyya śikṣāṃ
    idaṃ tataḥ puṇyu viśiṣṭu bhoti // 4 //

ye dāni te[ṣāṃ] puruṣarṣabhāṇāṃ
    saddharmi lujyanti upekṣa bhāvayī
na tair jinā satkṛtā bhonti kecid
    na co kṛtaṃ gauravu nāyakeṣu // 5 //

// 3 // Who would do homage to a great number of Buddhas with food, with drink, having a devout mind; [and so] with umbrellas, flags and with offerings of lamps for as many koṭis of kalpas as there are grains of sand in the Ganges;

// 4 // And who, when the Good Law is being destroyed, when the teaching of the Sugatas is being obstructed, for a single day and night would practise the discipline - this [latter] is a more excellent merit than the [first].

// 5 // Who now would be indifferent when the Good Law of those Best of Men is being destroyed - not by them are any of the Jinas honored, and no respect is shown to the guides.

SR XXXII 278-79: GBMs ix 2692.5-2693.1; GMs ii 452.9-16; Pek vol. 32, 9-5 = 5-6

śīlaṃ samādhī satatu niṣevamāṇo
    dhyānān vimokṣāṃs tathapi ca apramāṇāṃ
śunyānimittān satatu niṣevamāṇo
    na cireṇa so hi sugatu bhavāti loke // 278 //

eṣā hi pūjā paramaviśiṣṭa mahyaṃ
    yaḥ śīlaskandhe pratiṣṭhita bodhisatvaḥ
sada sarvabuddhā tena supūjitā hi
    kṣayāntakāle ya sthitu bodhicitte // 279 //

// 278 // Constantly pursuing morality, the samādhis, and so also the trances, the releases, and the immeasurables;

constantly pursuing the empty and signless - he soon comes to be a Sugata in the world.

// 279 // Which bodhisattva is established in the categories of morality - just this is the most excellent pūjā to me. By him who has taken his stand on the thought of awakening in the final period of destruction are all Buddhas always, indeed, well worshipped.

Group II.

SR Ch VI: GBMs ix 2507.1ff, GMs ii 67.1ff; TDK 61, 779.1ff; Pek. vol. 31, 280-1-7ff.

[1][Then the Blessed One once again addressed the Crown Prince Candraprabha:] Therefore here, Crown Prince, by a bodhisattva, (mahāsattva, desiring this Samādhi and desiring quickly to awaken to utmost, right and full awakening) the preparation for this Samādhi is to be undertaken ([samādhi]parikarma karaṇīyaṃ; tiṅ ṅe 'dzin 'di yoṅs su sbyaṅ bar bya'o). Then, Crown Prince, what is the preparation for this Samādhi ? Here, O Crown Prince, a bodhisattva, mahāsattva, [with a mind firmly established in great compassion] is actively engaged in acts of pūjā directed toward [abiding] or parinirvāṇed Tathāgatas; that is to say, (pūjā) through robes and alms-bowls and couches and seats and medicines to cure the sick [through the standard belongings (of a monk); through flowers and incense and perfumes and garlands and unguents] and aromatic powders and strips of cloth and umbrellas and flags and banners, through (the music) of tūryas . tāḍāvacaras. And the root of merit (resulting from that) he turns over towards the obtaining of this Samādhi (tac ca kuśalamūlaṃ samādhipratilaṃbhāya pari[ṇāmayati]). [He, anticipating no dharma whatsoever] does pūjā to the Tathāgata ([sa na kaṃcid dharmam ākāṅkṣaṃs tathā]gataṃ pūjayati; de chos gaṅ la yaṅ re ba'i phyir de bźin gśegs pa la mchod par mi byed de /), not (anticipating) form, nor sense pleasures, nor objects of enjoyment, nor heaven (svargaṃ), nor a retinue, nor (anything) to be found in all the threefold universe.[2] And moreover, [he, having his thoughts on dharma ([dharmacittako bhavati]), not[3]

anticipating (anything)], does not observe, does not apprehend the Tathāgata through the dharmakāya, how much less will he apprehend him through something other than the dharmakāya[4]. Therefore in this case, Crown Prince, [this is the pūjā to the Tathāgatas]([eṣā sā tathāgatānāṃ pūjā]), that is to say: the non-seeing of the Tathāgatas, and the non-apprehension of a self, and the state of not anticipating the maturation of action (tathāgatasyādarśanam ā[tma]naś cānupalabdhiḥ karmavipākasya cāpratikāṃkṣaṇatā.) [Having done pūjā to the Tathāgata] through this [pūjā] having the three spheres[5] purified, [the bodhisattva, mahāsattva] obtains this Samādhi. [6)]He through this turning-over in which the three spheres are purified, presenting however little (? kiyaparīttatāpi) through flowers, garlands, perfumes, and unguents ..... (G damaged) ... he turns (it) over. For him the roots of merit from that are inconceivable, inconceivable the maturation; and he obtains this Samādhi; and quickly to utmost, right and full awakening [he awakens].[(6]

[1)]I have not given the whole of the Sanskrit text for this passage for a number of reasons: it is rather straightforward prose; it is shorter and therefore less chopped up than the pieces from Ch. V; and the redactional differences do not appear to have been so great as with the latter chapter. I have however inserted the original into the translation between parentheses for all the passages which appear significant for the argument. Although the Gilgit Ms for this passage is again fragmentary, enough survives to indicate that it differed in some ways from the Nepalese redaction. Where at all possible I have followed the Gilgit text. Anything based on the Nepalese redaction - whether text or my translation - is enclosed within brackets, and the important points of difference between the two redactions are signalled in the following notes.
[2)]G: na sarvatraidhātuke vyavacāraniḥsṛtaḥ; neither the Nepalese redaction nor the Tibetan translation have anything corresponding to this. [3)]G is missing here, and although N has sa ākāṅkṣan and T de dod pa na, both what has preceded and what follows seems to suggest that a na has dropped out. I have therefore translated as if the text read sa na-ākāṅkṣan. [4)]G: ...rmakāyato pi tathāgataṃ na-m-anupaśyati nopalabhate·kim aṃga punar anyaṃ dharmakāyata upalapsyate;

but N and T: dharmakāyato 'pi tathāgataṃ nopalabhate, kim aṅga punā rūpakāyata upalapsyate. [5] On the term trimaṇḍalapariśuddhi see *BHSD* 258[1]; here it would refer to the doer of pūjā, the act of pūjā, and the object to which the pūjā is directed. To say all three are 'purified' is to say that all three are regarded as ultimately empty, cf. the 3rd verse in the gāthās which follow this section. [6] (6 N and T have simply (... samādhiṃ pratilabhate,) kṣipraṃ cānuttarāṃ samyaksaṃbodhim abhisaṃbudhyate. G, however, was fuller: (... samādhiṃ pratilabhate · so nena trmaṇḍalapariśuddhena pariṇāmena kiyaparīttatāpi puṣpamālyagandhavilepanena tathā ... (at least 20 akṣaras are probably missing) ... riṇāmayati · tasya tatkuśalamūlam acintyaṃ bhavaty acintyavipākaṃ · imaṃ ca samādhiṃ pratilabhate · kṣipraṃ cānuttarāṃ samyaksaṃbodhi ...

The last of the three chapters in *SR* which is wholly devoted to the question of pūjā is Ch. XXXIII. Since Filliozat ("La mort volontaire par le feu et la tradition bouddhique indienne", *JA* 251 (1963) 21-51) has already published an almost complete translation of this chapter it will be sufficient here to give only a brief summary of its contents and to note those passages which articulate the conception, or conceptions, of pūjā which the chapter wants to establish.

In form Ch. XXXIII is another pūrvayoga: in a past time there was a Tathāgata named Ghoṣadatta; after teaching innumerable beings, he parinirvāṇed. A king by the name of Śrīghoṣa then built thousands of stūpas and placed thousands and thousands of lamps on each stūpa, and offered incense, perfumes, etc. Being so engaged, he also assembled a large number of bodhisattvas, all of whom were reciters of dharma, and attended on them with the requisites. One night, after doing magnificent pūjā at the stūpa, the king with his followers goes to hear dharma from the assembly of bodhisattvas. Among that assembly there is a young bodhisattva, Kṣemadatta, who sees the illumination of all those lamps and resolves to do pūjā which would surpass that of Śrīghoṣa. He wraps his arm in cloth, soaks it in oil, and sets it afire. The illumination of his burning arm dims all the lamps of Śrīghoṣa, the earth trembles, etc. Śrīghoṣa, weeping at the loss of Kṣemadatta's arm, praises him in verse, and Kṣemadatta answers him, also in verses, the most important of which are the following:

SR XXXIII 12-15: GBMs ix 2700.2-4; GMs ii 463.9-16; Pek. vol. 32, 11-3-1=3-4

naivaṃ syād aṃgahīno 'sau yasya bāhur na vidyate
sa tu devāṃgahīna syā[d] yasya śīlaṃ na vidyate // 12 //

anena pūtikāyena pūjitā me tathāgatā
acintiyā dakṣiṇīyā sarvalokasya cetiyā // 13 //

anantā yas trisāhasrā ratnānāṃ paripūritā
pradadyā[l]lokanāthebhyo buddhajñānagaveṣakaḥ // 14 //

asty eṣā laukikī pūjā anyā pūjā acintiyā
ye dharmāṃ cchunyā[n] jānanti tyajante kāyajīvitaṃ // 15 //

// 12 // He for whom an arm does not (in fact) exist could not thus be deprived of a limb; but, O King, he for whom there is no morality would indeed be deprived of a limb.

// 13 // By this foul smelling body are the Tathāgatas worshipped by me - those inconceivable Shrines of All the World which are to be honored;

// 14 // (and) who, (even if) seeking the knowledge of a Buddha, having filled this boundless three thousand (world system) with precious things would present it to the Lords of Men -

// 15 // This (still) is worldly pūjā. The inconceivable pūjā is something (quite) different: those who know dharmas are empty, they reject (even the idea of) body and life.

Kṣemadatta then performs an 'act of truth (satyavākya) and his arm reappears.

Apart from the verses quoted above, the important passages in the chapter are those which express the motivation behind the acts of pūjā of the two individuals. Śrīghoṣa's activity is expressed in the following terms:

tasya tathāgatasya pari[ni]rvṛtasya pūjārthaṃ tathāgatadhātugarbhāṇāṃ caturaśītistūpakoṭīsahasrāṇi kārayām āsa (2693.6); that is to say, his activity is undertaken simply "for the sake of worshipping that parinirvāṇed Tathāgata". Kṣemadatta's activity, on the other hand, is expressed thus: yan(nv) aham imaṃ samādhim ākāṃkṣaṃs tathāgatapūjāṃ kuryām (2695.7), "what if I, *desiring this Samādhi*, would do pūjā to the Tathāgata"; and: atha kṣema[da]ttasya bodhisattvasya mahāsattvasyādhyāśayenānuttarāṃ samyaksaṃbodhiṃ paryeṣamāṇasya tathā pradīpte dakṣiṇe bāhau nābhū[t] cittasya mukhavarṇasya vānyathātvaṃ, "then since *the intention* of the bodhisattva, mahāsattva, Kṣemadatta, *was to seek utmost, right and perfect awakening*, so while his right arm was burning there was not (the slightest) change in his mind or of the expression on his face"; and finally: yenāsau dīpito bāhu buddhajñānasya kāraṇāt, "when that arm was burnt *for the sake of the knowledge of a buddha*".

Shorter passages of the same kind are:

SR XXXV 68: GBMs ix 2739.2-4; GMs ii 522.3-6; Pek. vol. 32, 18-2 = 3-2

pūjāṃ co atulāṃ karonti muditā puṣpebhi gandhebhi co
gṛhya cchatradhvajā patāka vividhā saṃgītibhāṇḍāni ca
no cāpī abhinandiṣū bhavagatiṃ jñātvāna śūnyāṃ bhavāṃs
tenā lakṣaṇacitritā daśabalā bhāsaṃti sarvā diśaḥ // 69 //

// 69 // Having taken up umbrellas and flags, banners and various implements of music, and with flowers and perfumes they, joyful, perform innumerable pūjās, but they do not rejoice in a state of existence, having known (all) existences as empty. By reason of that all the Buddhas in the (ten) directions appear ornamented with the marks.

And

SR XXXI 19-20: GBMs ix 2662.3-4; GMs ii 400.7-12; Pek. vol. 32, 4-3-5-7

teno pūjita bhonti nāyakā dvipadendrā
yo 'sau dharmasvabhāvu jānatī sada śūnyām // 19 //

teno pūjita sarvi nāyakā ya atitās
tatha te pūjita ye anāgatā dvipadendrāḥ

tehī satkṛta sarvi nāyakā sthita ye co
yo 'sau dharmasvabhāvu jānatī sada śūnyam // 20 //

// 19 // That one who knows always that the own-being of dharmas is empty - by him are the Guides, the Leaders of men, worshipped.

// 20 // That one who knows always that the own-being of dharmas is empty - by him are all the past Guides worshipped, so also those who are to be the future Leaders of men are worshipped, and by him are honored all the Guides who [just now] abide.

Group III.

SR XXIV 55-59: GBMs ix 2622.5-2623.1; GMs ii 321.15-322.12; Pek. vol. 31, 308-5-6 = 309-1-3:

śīlaskandhe sthihitvā ca bahuśrutyam upārjayet
imaṃ samādhim eṣantaḥ pūjayec chāstu dhātavaḥ // 55 //

chatrair dhvajaiḥ patākābhir gandhamālyavilepanair
kārayet pūja buddhasya samādhiṃ śāntam eṣatoḥ // 56 //

rañjanīyehi tūryehi saṃgītiṃ saṃprayojayet
pūjayed dhātuṃ buddhasyānavalīno atandritaḥ // 57 //

yāvanti gandhamālyāni dhūpanaṃ cūrṇacailikaṃ
sarvais taiḥ pūjayen nāthaṃ buddhajñānasya kāraṇāt // 58 //

yāvatī pūrvabuddhānāṃ kṛtā pūjā acintiyā
aniḥsṛtena bhūtvenaṃ samādhiṃ śāntam eṣatā // 59 //, etc.

// 55 // Having taken his stand on the categories of morality, he would gain great learning; desiring this Samādhi he would do pūjā to the relics of the teacher.

// 56 // With umbrellas, with flags, with banners, with perfumes and garlands and unguents he would do pūjā to the Buddha from a desire for this auspicious Samādhi.

// 57 // He would perform music with delightful tūryas, he would do pūjā to the relic of the Buddha, confident and unwearied.

// 58 // As many as are the perfumes and garlands, the incenses, the aromatic powders and strips of cloth, with all these he would do pūjā to the Lord for the sake of the knowledge of the Buddha.

// 59 // As much as is the inconceivable pūjā done to former Buddhas through seeking for this auspicious Samādhi, having become one not relying on a basis; etc.

In this passage - as in those we have already studied from Chs. VI and XXXIII - one performs pūjā for the sake of obtaining this Samādhi. Samādhi here, as throughout the *Samādhirāja*, is a multi-valent term: it may mean a particular samādhi - although the *Samādhirāja* as a particular samādhi is nowhere described or mentioned in the text - or it may mean the *Samādhirāja-sūtra*. If it refers to a particular samādhi, then 'the intention to obtain the Samādhi' must be understood to mean the intention to realize or incorporate into one's behaviour that particular concentrated insight; if it refers to the *Samādhirāja-sūtra*, then the intention to obtain that sūtra cannot be understood to mean simply obtaining a particular text , but must also mean the internalization of the 'teaching' contained in that text, the internalization of the response to the world which that text articulates. Since this Samādhi/Sūtra-teaching is in several places in the text explicitly equated with the 'awakening' (bodhi) of the Buddha (see for example XXXVI 15a quoted below), then to seek this Samādhi/Sūtra-teaching is to seek the awakening of a Buddha, and, in line with this, we find in the above passage, as elsewhere in similar contexts, the terms Samādhi, bodhi and buddhajñāna used interchangeably to express the goal toward which one is directed in undertaking pūjā. Passages of this kind are numerically the most significant kind of passage dealing with pūjā in the *Samādhirāja* as a whole. They are found at II 8, 18; III 12; XIII 26; XV 5, 7, 8, 9; XVII 27; XVIII 9, 21, 50, 52, 53; XXIV 38; XXV 3; XXIX 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55; XXXII 233, 236; XXXVII 2, 78-81. With these should also be grouped XIV 40, 49, 54 (where acts of pūjā precede a vow to become a buddha); XXXII 165, 277 (where pūjā is

preparatory to obtaining this samādhi) and XXIX 114 (where pūjā is undertaken bhavāntakaraṇe).

Group IV.

SR XI 43-47: GBMs ix 2547.4-7; GMs ii 164.1-16; Pek. vol. 31, 290-4-7 = 5-2.

[sarva jina atīta pūjitās te
    apa][1]rimitā ya anāgatāś ca buddhāḥ
daśasu diśasu ye sthitāś ca buddhā
    ima vara śānta samādhi deśayitvā // 44 //

yatha [naru [2]iha kaści puṇyakāmo
    daśaba]lakāru[ṇi]kān upasthaheyyā
aparimita ananta kalpakoṭī-
    r aparimitaṃ ca janetva premu teṣu // 45 //

dvītiyu naru bhaveta puṇya[kāmo
    itu paramārthanayāt tu][3] gātha[m] ekāṃ
dhariya carimakāli vartamāne
    [puri]maku puṇya kalāṃ na bhoti tasya // 46 //

parama iya viśiṣṭa buddhapūjā
    carima[ki dāruṇi kāli varttamāne
ca][4]tupadam ita gātha eka śrutvā
    dhārayi pūjita tena sarvabuddhāḥ // 47 //

[1] The Gilgit Ms for this passage is fragmentary so I have given the reconstruction - presumably based on the Nepalese Mss. - supplied by Dutt in brackets and will add in these notes the Tibetan translation which appears to correspond to the missing passages. T: 'das pa'i rgyal ba dpag med thams cad daṅ /. [2] T: skyes bu la la bsod nams 'dod pas 'dir / stobs bcu ldan pa('i)... [3] T: bsod nams 'dod pa yis / don dam tshul 'di las ni ... [4] T: phyi ma mi zad dus su gyur pa'i tshe.

// 44 // Having taught (Nepalese redaction: 'having preserved') this choicest auspicious Samādhi, [all the past Jinas are worshipped], and which are the innumerable future Buddhas, as well as the Buddhas now in the ten directions.

// 45 // As [some man desiring merit here] would serve those compassionate [Daśabalas] for immeasurable, endless koṭīs of kalpas, having generated immeasurable love for them;

// 46 // (and) there would be a second man [desiring] merit; he during the last time would preserve a single gāthā [from this method of the highest meaning] - that former merit is not (even a) small part of this (latter's merit).

// 47 // This is the highest, most excellent pūjā of the Buddha: having heard [during the last terrible times] a single gāthā of [four] lines from this (text, and) then to preserve it - by that all Buddhas are worshipped.

SR XXXVI 14-15a: GBMs ix 2749.4-5; GMs ii 547.7-11; Pek. vol. 32, 21-4-8 = 5-1.

tasmāt kumāreha ya bodhisatvo
    ākāṃkṣate pūjitu sarvabuddhān
atīta utpanna tathāgatāṃś ca
    dhāretu vācetu imaṃ samādhiṃ // 14 //
eṣā [hi] sā bodhi tathāgatānāṃ // 15a //

// 14 // Therefore, O Kumāra, which bodhisatva here desires to do pūjā to all Buddhas, to the Tathāgatas past and present, he should preserve, he should recite this Samādhi[rāja-sūtra]. // 15a // For this, indeed, is the awakening of the Tathāgatas.

Two further examples may be seen at XXXII 135 and 142.

[Apart from the passages which have been referred to above, reference to pūjā occurs in the *Samādhirāja* in only two other forms: in epithets of the Buddha or of bodhisattvas at XVII 29, 165; XXIX 1; XXX 199, 204, etc.; and in narrative contexts where the term is used in a purely conventional sense (this is especially common in the nidānas of individual chapters) at II 5; X passim (the whole of this long chapter is given over to describing how various categories of beings - devas, asuras, etc. - performed pūjā to the Buddha as he entered Rājagṛha); XVI 28; GMs ii 217.5,8; XVII 107; GMs ii 275.2; XX 6,8; XXI 26; etc.]

The following points might be noted in reference to these passages.

1) As I have intimated at the beginning, passages of this kind are found at Gilgit in *SR* alone. In this sense they undeniably represent the minority view and this position within the literature as a whole must be clearly kept in mind.

2) It is obvious that the compilers of *SR* were inordinately preoccupied with the 'problem' of pūjā. There is perhaps no other single topic which receives so much attention. It is equally obvious that their response to the 'problem' was by no means consistent. The passages in which we find this response in fact fall naturally into no less than four groups.

3) The first kind of response is found in our Group I. I refer here specifically to Ch. V. The construction of the argument of Ch. V is basically rather simple. It consists of the juxtaposition of a series of paired opposites. At the simplest level the opposition is between 'what people do' and 'what people ought to do'. In the first prose section this opposition is expressed in terms of type of behavior - pūjā through-material-things versus practice or practice of dharma (which at the end of the section is called 'pūjā-through dharma') - and in terms of difference of intention - concern with things-of-this-world, with the hereafter, with having a limited end for one's roots of merit, versus being concerned with roots of merit having an unlimited end. Verse 3 repeats the first opposition with only slight variation in terminology, while verses 7-9 express it with a new set of opposites: living as a householder versus 'going forth' as a monk. Verses 18 and 20-21 then recapitulate what has gone before, giving final expression to the basic sets of opposites in terms of satkāru ... lokāmiṣeṇo versus dharmapūjā, and gṛhavāsa versus pratipatti dharmeṣu.

At this stage two points can be noted. First, since Ch. V takes as its point of departure 'what people do', and since its entire emphasis is on contrasting this with 'what people ought to do', it seems fairly obvious that what we have in this chapter is a conscious attempt to redefine and redirect what was in fact the pre-existing and prevalent conception of pūjā. The text is not simply developing a point-of-view, but is *reacting* to a point-of-view already firmly established. The second point to be noted is that this reaction is in no way a new one in the history of

Buddhist doctrine. If for the sake of simplification we express the opposition in terms of pūjā versus pratipatti, then its similarity, its virtual sameness, with the attitude which - though it only rarely receives formal expression - dominates the entire Pali Canon as we have received it, is strikingly apparent. In the *Mahāparinibbāna-suttanta* V.3, when the Buddha is near his end, the Sāla trees bloom out of season and drop their flowers on him, heavenly flowers fall from the sky, and heavenly music, all for the sake of doing pūjā to the Tathāgata (tathāgatassa pūjāya). But the Buddha turns to Ānanda and says:

> na kho ānanda ettāvattā tathāgato sakkato vā hoti gurukato vā mānito vā pūjito vā apacito vā. yo kho ānanda bhikkhu vā bhikkhunī vā upāsako vā upāsikā vā dhammānudhammapaṭipanno viharati samīcipaṭipanno anudhammacārī, so tathāgataṃ sakkaroti gurukaroti māneti pūjeti paramāya pūjāya.

> But not, Ānanda, by such is the Tathāgata honored or revered or reverenced or worshipped or adored. But which monk or nun or lay man or woman abides practising in accordance with dhamma, correctly practising, acting in accordance, that one honors the Tathāgata, reveres, reverences, worships and adores him through the most excellent pūjā. (Cf. the 'paraphrase'(?) of this passage at *Jātakamālā* (Kern ed.) 207.13-17.)

Clearly then, the attitude which is being expressed by Ch. V of the *Samādhirāja*, the attempt to substitute for the conception of pūjā-as-worship a conception of pūjā-as-practice defined primarily in the sense of monastic discipline, is not unique to it. As a matter of fact it appears to have been an old attitude which was shared by at least some members of both the Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna. This is further illustrated by the fact that the whole of this chapter of a Mahāyāna text could have easily been accepted as doctrinally 'orthodox' by even the most conservative Theravādin monk. That it was not the predominant attitude in Buddhist India, however, is equally well illustrated by our other texts, as well as by the richness of even the mere remnant of surviving Buddhist art and religious architecture.

We also find exactly the same opposition between pūjā and practice expressed in the shorter passages cited under Group I and it is important to note that all these passages respond almost exclusively to what can be called the behavioral component of the 'problem' of pūjā.

4) A second, more complicated response, is found in the passages cited under Group II. I begin here with Ch. VI. Ch. V, although it refers to a difference of intention, is, as we have seen above, primarily occupied with the behavioral component, with kinds of action - worship versus practice, dwelling in the house versus 'going forth' as a monk. Ch. VI, on the other hand, wants to respond to the problem from quite a different angle, and its response appears to involve at least three different components. First, in terms of the behavioral, Ch. VI does not wish to exclude pūjā-as-worship. On the contrary, this is the only type of activity which our chapter envisions, and what it understands by that activity is unmistakably spelled out: it is exactly that which Ch. V called pūjā-through-things-of-this-world'. This then - in terms of the behavioral component - is what is to be done. But it is to be done with a particular intention (the intentional component) and with a particular understanding (the cognitive component).

As we have seen, Ch. V had already referred to the intentional component, but it was limited to stating the contrast between the intention behind pūjā (concern with things of this world and the hereafter) and the intention behind practice (concern with roots of merit having an unlimited end). Ch. VI, however, goes beyond this. It specifies that pūjā is to be undertaken as a "preparation" for this Samādhi/Sūtra-teaching, and that the roots of merit resulting from that pūjā are to be turned towards obtaining this Samādhi/Sūtra-teaching. It also expresses the intentional component negatively: it is not undertaken for the sake of objects of the world, heaven, nor anything in the threefold universe. For Ch. V this appears to have been the only possible intention behind pūjā-through-things-of-this-world, but Ch. VI, by not accepting this limitation, and by introducing a more acceptable (to it) intention behind pūjā, clearly undercuts Ch. V's opposition. It is important to emphasize that the introduction of this more acceptable intention is precisely the factor which allows Ch. VI - unlike Ch.V - to not only accept, but to advocate pūjā-as-worship on the behavioral level. But Ch. VI does not stop here.

If pūjā is to be done (behavioral), but is to be done with a particular intention (intentional), it is also to be done with a particular mental outlook (the cognitive component). What this cognitive component consists of is once again clearly spelled out by Ch. VI, first when it says: He, doing pūjā, "does not observe, does not apprehend the Tathāgata through the dharmakāya, how much less will he apprehend him through something other than the dharmakāya"; and then in its final summation when it says: "This is pūjā to the Tathāgatas, that is to say: the non-seeing of the Tathāgatas, and the non-apprehension of a self, and the state of not anticipating the maturation of actions." That is to say, one behaves in such a way, one undertakes religious activity, though in so doing one does not 'apprehend', one does not cognitively acknowledge an agent of this activity nor an object toward which that activity is directed; and one does not anticipate that acting in this way will have a definite result. However, the result of that action, more correctly the repetition of that action - the text is not talking about a single act of pūjā - is the obtainment of this Samādhi/Sūtra-teaching, i.e., the internalization of the behavioral-cognitive pattern contained therein, and the relatively quick *total* internalization of this patterned response to the world: religious activity without cognitive acknowledgement, that is to say, Buddhahood. Although much less clearly expressed, there is one other chapter in the *Samādhirāja* which is struggling to express something like the same idea. This is Ch. XXXIII.

Clearly the author of this chapter - like that of Ch. VI - wanted to emphasize the intentional component in the action of Kṣemadatta - it is mentioned three times in a relatively short space - and by so doing, presumably, to contrast it with that of Śrīghoṣa. The demonstration of this difference in intention is elsewhere in *SR* apparently enough for the author to make his point. Here, however, he seems to want to go beyond this, at least this is the impression one gets from vs. 14 where he says that even if one gives material gifts to the Buddha with the intention of gaining the knowledge of a Buddha, this is still laukikī pūjā. The author also seems to imply in vs. 13 - at least in the way I have understood it - that although much superior to Śrīghoṣa's gifts, Kṣemadatta's apparent gift of his arm is still in the category of worldly pūjā (this is narratively indicated by the fact that the result of both acts, although quantitatively different are qualitatively the same, i.e. 'illumination' in the

sense of actual light). What our author, in fact, wants to emphasize above all appears to be a cognitive pattern which would underlie even the intention. He indicates what he means by this in vs. 12 where he says in effect that there can be no loss of a limb for someone who has no conception of an arm, and in vs. 15 where he says that the pūjā acintiyā - obvious the kind of pūjā he wants to argue for - is where someone knows all dharmas are empty and therefore rejects '(the idea of) body and life'. That such 'knowledge' is the real meaning of Kṣemadatta's 'gift' is also indicated by the last two parts of his three part 'act of truth': yena satyena dharmo 'sau bāhur nāma na vidyate / tena satyena me bāhur bhoti kṣipraṃ yathā purā // 21 // yena satyena dharmo 'sau kṣemadatto na vidyate, etc.

All of the passages in our Group II then respond to the 'problem' of pūjā in terms not of the behavioral component, but in terms, first, of the intentional component, and above all in terms of the cognitive component. This means - and it is important to keep this in mind - that pūjā is unambiguously accepted and advocated if it is undertaken with an acceptable (to the compilers of *SR*) intention (obtainment of bodhi, internalization of the Samādhi/Sūtra-teaching, etc.), and if it is approached and 'perceived' in an acceptable manner.

5) The passages cited under Group III represent yet another kind of response, although it has much in common with that found in Group II passages. It, in fact, represents virtually the same response except that Group III passages do not go beyond the question of intention. All these passages presuppose the point of depature which in Ch.s V, VI and XXXIII is explicitly stated: they begin from what was obviously the prevailing and predominant conception of pūjā in the environment which surrounded them - a Buddhist environment - that is to say, pūjā-as-worship undertaken to secure material benefits in this life, or rebirth in a 'heaven' in the next. In approaching this situation they do not attempt a radical displacement of the behavioral component of pūjā-as-worship. Acts of pūjā are, again, not only accepted, but advocated (narratively it is stated that acts of pūjā have been, are being, or should be undertaken, depending on the individual contexts). What these passages want to do is simply redirect the intentional component of pūjā-as-worship, to substitute for material benefits, rebirth in 'heaven', etc., the obtaining, the inter-

nalization of this Samādhi/Sūtra-teaching. They do not, unlike the passages in Group II, go beyond this, bracketing as it were the whole question of a cognitive component. As has already been noted passages of this type in the *Samādhirāja* are numerically the most significant. Whether numerical significance is the same as doctrinal significance is difficult to say, but the fact that these passages represent the most common response in the text as a whole is not without interest. Certainly this is the least innovative of the attempted 'revaluations' of pūjā which the text develops and, as a consequence, perhaps stood the best chance of acceptance in what appears to have been a basically conservative tradition.

6) Group IV passages represent an approach which plays a much more important role elsewhere, but which in the *Samādhirāja* is of minor importance. There are in fact only four passages in which this approach is developed. Here we find pūjā defined in terms of the preservation of the teaching, i.e. to preserve the teaching, usually in "the last time", is to worship all Buddhas.

7) Apart from these more specific remarks, we can also add some more general observations concerning all of these passages taken as a whole. The first is that their defensive posture is everywhere apparent; everywhere their discussions begin from the same point of departure. They do not develop their argument on its own terms, but always in reaction to a given situation and that situation is always the same: Ch. V begins, both narratively and doctrinally, with Mahābala and his people doing pūjā to the Tathāgata through 'things-of-this-world'; Ch. XXXIII in the same way begins with Śrīghoṣa's elaborate performance of pūjā at the stūpa of Ghoṣadatta; even Ch. VI, the one major discussion which in form is not a pūrvayoga, clearly begins by taking pūjā-as-worship as a given. Pūjā for the authors of the *Samādhirāja* was a *fact*, and because of that, it appears to have been a problem.

8) The general terms with which we chose to describe these responses as a group are important. There appear to be at least three possibilities. They may be said to represent either 1) pieces of theological sophistry attempting to explain away a doctrinally embarrassing practice; or 2) they may express established views actually held by their authors and their readers at the time of their composition; or 3) they may represent tentative

gropings, or the prototypes of arguments not yet perfected in what was a genuine and on-going attempt by the developing śūnyatavādin world-view to incorporate into itself the accepted and predominant forms of Buddhist praxis. Although there are occasional hints of something like the first possibility, the repetition, the lack of consistency, the multiplication of alternate approaches, strongly implies that the most appropriate characterization is the third.

9) It is also important to note what is and what is not criticized in these passages. There is no explicit criticism of the cult of the book or book-worship, nor the cult of images, nor - significantly - of the ritual use of dhāraṇīs. Nor is there any criticism of pūjā undertaken for the sake of gaining rebirth in a buddhafield. The great majority of these passages, however, either explicitly or implicitly take as the object of their criticism activity connected with the worship of stūpas. They also explicitly criticize pūjā undertaken for the sake of rebirth in 'heaven' (svarga). I think, therefore, that it is clear that however much the conception of svarga and the conception of a buddhafield may appear to be alike in our eyes, the tradition itself never confused them. They also explicitly criticize pūjā undertaken for reasons connected with "the here-and-now" and with "the hereafter", with "sense pleasures" and "objects of enjoyment". This, of course, is an explicit criticism of some, if not all, of the fundamental intentions of karmatic Buddhism. (It remains to be seen whether or not 'concern with rebirth in a buddhafield' would be included under the category 'concern with the hereafter' and, therefore, be at least *implicitly* criticized here.)

10) As I said at the beginning of this section, these passages are important because they illustrate better than anything I know the differences between karmatic and bodhic Buddhism. And I think it will be obvious from all that has been said so far that these differences are not primarily behavioral. The two 'Buddhisms' do not *necessarily* require two different kinds of religious activity. This is especially clear in *SR* Chs. VI and XXXIII. The differences are above all differences of intention. In one, religious acts are performed for reasons connected with "the here-and-now" and with "the hereafter"; in the other, the same acts are undertaken for reasons connected with the obtainment of bodhi. The cognitive component, though a significant presence in Chs. VI and XXXIII, is not - when these passages are taken as a whole - of primary importance.

[15]

Again further, Mañjuśrī, which believing sons or daughters of good family take up for as long as they live the threefold refuge (and) are without another devatā; which preserve the five rules of training; which preserve the ten rules of training; which preserve the obligations of a bodhisattva, the four hundred rules of training; again, which monks, having gone forth from dwelling in a house, preserve the two hundred and fifty rules of training; which nuns preserve the five hundred rules of training - which of these, having the (rules of) training and obligations in accordance with what they have undertaken, afterwards come to be fallen from one or another rule of training 1) *(and) are afraid from fear of (rebirth in) an unfortunate destiny or unfortunate state: which of these worship and do pūjā to the Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabha, the Tathāgata*(1*; for them the suffering of the three unfortunate states is not to be expected. (And) any woman who at the time of giving birth experiences excessively sharp unpleasant feelings,* 2) *(and) who worships and does pūjā to the Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabha, the Tathāgata*(2, 3) *she is quickly freed*(3*; she will give birth to a son having all his limbs fully formed, handsome, beautiful, worthy of being seen, having sharp faculties, possessing intelligence, healthy having very little trouble; (and) it will not be possible for his vital warmth to be snatched away by non-human beings.*

1)(1X, Śikṣ: '... if they, afraid from fear of (rebirth in) an unfortunate destiny, would preserve the name of the Blessed One Bhaiṣajya-guruvaiḍūryaprabha, the Tathāgata, and would perform pūjā (to him) in accordance with their resources' (Śikṣ alone has the final clause); Z has

'... which perform pūjā to the Blessed One, etc.'; and T: '... which would perform various kinds of pūjā'. 2)(2X: '(and) who would recollect the name of, and perform pūjā to the Blessed One, etc.'; T simply 'would do pūjā'. 3)(3X: she delivers in comfort'.

This section requires only a few brief observations. The first concerns the term ananyadevatā. Edgerton, under ananyadeva (*BHSD* 20[1]), says: "...Burnouf, Lotus 581, followed by BR, *not having* (recognizing) *other gods* (implausible)." Although this meaning of ananyadeva as an epithet of the Buddha may be "implausible"; and although I have not met the term elsewhere at Gilgit, it is difficult to believe that this is not the meaning of ananyadevatā in the present passage. [Outside of Gilgit see P.M. Harrison, *The Tibetan Text of the Pratyutpanna-Buddha-Saṃmukhāvasthita-Samādhi-Sūtra (Studia Philologica Buddhica,* Monograph Series I). The Reiyukai Library, in the press, 11B: des saṅs rgyas la skyabs su 'gro bar bya'o // chos la skyabs su 'gro bar bya'o // dge 'dun la skyabs su 'gro bar bya'o // tshul khrims yoṅs su dag par bya'o // bslab pa'i gźi lṅa yoṅs su gzuṅ bar bya'o // lha gźan med par bya źiṅ bsam pa saṅs rgyas kyi rjes su soṅ bar bya'o //; 12B: dge bsñen mas gsum la skyabs su soṅ źiṅ lha gźan med par bya'o //; 12C: saṅs rgyas chos daṅ de bźin dge 'dun las / lha gźan med ciṅ, etc.]

A second point to be noted - and one I have already referred to - is that this passage makes it clear that the cult of Bhaiṣajyaguru was as much a 'monastic' cult as it was a lay one. As a matter of fact, this single passage refers to virtually every possible status within the Buddhist community: lay men and women, monks, nuns and bodhisattvas. This, in turn, further confirms the fact that karmatic Buddhism cannot be equated with "lay Buddhism", and that the concerns of karmatic Buddhism were shared by at least some members of every group within the overall Buddhist community.

A final point concerns the reference to "the four hundred rules of training of the Bodhisattva". This is the only such reference I know of at Gilgit, or anywhere else for that matter. (This same passage is quoted in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya.*) We have, in fact, very little definite information on a, or the, Mahāyāna Vinaya, and there may be a very good reason for that: there may not have been any. On this whole question there is nothing that

comes close to L. de La Vallée Poussin's "Notes bouddhique XVII - Opinions sur les relations des deux véhicules au point de vue du Vinaya", *BCLS* 16 (1930) 20-39. And it is interesting to note that the discovery of the Gilgit Mss. goes a long way towards confirming the essentials of what de La Vallée Poussin puts forth as "opinions": we find at Gilgit a collection of literature which is essentially and overwhelmingly Mahāyāna; the Hīnayāna texts are both very few and very short. But the Vinaya which apparently governed this same community was that of the Mūlasarvāstivāda. This situation is, of course, to a large degree paralleled in the Tibetan Kanjur. [For some other interesting comments on the "Mahāyāna Vinaya" and related topics see L. de La Vallée Poussin, "Notes bouddhiques VII - Le Vinaya et la pureté d'intention", *BCLS* 15 (1929) 201-17; N. Dutt, *Aspects of Mahāyāna Buddhism and Its Relation to Hīnayāna* (London: 1930) 290-322; P. Python, *Vinaya-Viniścaya-Upāli-Paripṛcchā, Enquête d'Upāli pour une exégèse de la discipline*, (Paris: 1973) 6-18.]

[16]

Then again the Blessed One addressed the Venerable Ānanda: 'Will you, Ānanda, believe, will you have faith when I will proclaim the qualities and blessings[1] of the Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūrya-prabha, the Tathāgata, Arhat, Samyaksaṃbuddha, or is there for you an uncertainty, a doubt or hesitation here in the profound range of the Buddha ?'

Then the Venerable Ānanda said this to the Blessed One: 'Not for me, O Reverend Blessed One, is there an uncertainty, nor a doubt, nor a hesitation in the dharmas[2] spoken by the Tathāgata. What is the reason for that ? There is no impure conduct in body, speech or mind of the Tathāgatas. Blessed One, both the sun and the moon, though having great power, though having great might, could fall to the ground; Sumeru, the king of mountains, could move from its established place; but never could the speech of the Buddha's be otherwise (than fact). Still, O Reverend Blessed One, there are beings having imperfect faculties of faith [3)] to whom, after having heard this range of the Buddha, it occurs thus[(3]: 'How can it be that through merely recollecting the name of that Tathāgata there are so many qualities and blessings?' (And) they do not believe, they do not have faith in it, they repudiate it. For a long time this will be for their non-profit and disadvantage and discomfort, for their downfall'.

The Blessed One said: 'It is impossible, Ānanda, it is out of the question that of those on whose ear the name of that Tathāgata should fall there could be (i.e. in the long run) the undergoing of an unfortunate destiny or an unfortunate rebirth[4]. Hard to be believed, Ānanda, is the Buddha-range of Buddhas. That you, Ānanda,

believe, that you have faith - this is to be seen as the power of the Tathāgata. And here is no place for all disciples and pratyekabuddhas, putting aside bodhisattvas, mahāsattvas, bound to one more birth. Difficult, Ānanda, is obtaining human birth. Difficult is belief and devotion in the Three Precious Things. Even more difficult is hearing the name of that Tathāgata. Without measure, Ānanda, is the bodhisattva course of that Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabha, the Tathāgata; without measure is his skill in means; without measure the extent of his vows. If I wanted to I could illuminate in detail the bodhisattva course of that Tathāgata for a kalpa or more than a kalpa, (and) the kalpa would be exhausted, but it would surely never be possible to reach an end of the extent of the excellence of the former vows of that Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabha, the Tathāgata.'

1) X, Śikṣ and T all have simply 'the qualities'. 2) X, Z and Śikṣ have instead 'in the sūtrāntas'. 3)(3 Śikṣ: ' ... who after having heard the range of the Buddha do not believe. To them it occurs thus: ...'; X: '(who) after having heard the range of the Buddha will speak thus: ...'. 4) X adds: 'This situation does not occur'.

---

a. I think that there can be very little doubt about the central importance of this passage. In a very real sense it is the king-pin on which all the rest depends since it indicates the authority on which the teaching is to be accepted. It is also interesting to note that the central question being answered here has, even in its phrasing, a very modern ring: 'How can it be that through merely recollecting the name of that Tathāgata there are so many qualities and blessings ?' The answer *Bhg* gives to that question - note that the answer actually precedes the question - is clear, concise and unequivocal: it can be because the Tathāgata says it is so, and 'never could the speech of the Buddha's be otherwise (than fact)'. But before we make too much of this it is important to note what else is asserted in the same

terms in the literature of Gilgit. I give here a few examples and have restricted myself to passages which employ the same anyathā vocabulary:

Vaj (Conze ed.) 14f: api tu khalu punaḥ subhūte bodhisattvenaivaṃrūpo dānaparityāgaḥ kartavyaḥ sarvasattvānām arthāya. tat kasya hetoḥ. yā caiṣā subhūte sattvasaṃjñā saivāsaṃjñā ya evam te sarvasattvās tathāgatena bhāṣitās ta evāsattvāḥ. tat kasya hetoḥ. bhūtavādī subhūte tathāgataḥ satyavādī tathāvādy ananyathāvādī tathāgataḥ na vitathavādī tathāgataḥ

Moreover again, Subhūti, by a bodhisattva such a giving of a gift is to be performed for the sake of all beings. What is the reason for that ? Which, Subhūti, is this perception of a being, just that is a non-perception; which also are all those beings spoken of by the Tathāgata, just those are non-beings. What is the reason for that ? A speaker of what is, Subhūti, is the Tathāgata; a speaker of truth, a speaker of such as it is, a speaker of that which is not otherwise is the Tathāgata. Not is the Tathāgata a speaker of that which is not so.

SR XIV: (said of the Buddha)

gaganaṃ pateyya saha śaśitārakehi
  pṛthivī vinaśyet sanagaraśailasaṃsthā
ākā[śadhātur api ca siyānyathātvaṃ
  no caiva] tubhyaṃ vitatha bhaveya vācā // 9 //
dṛṣṭvā tvaṃ duḥkhitān sattvān upalambharatāḥ prajāḥ
anopalambhaṃ deśesi gambhīraṃ śāntaśūnyatām // 10 //

. . .   . . .

yādṛśe śikṣito dharme tādṛśaṃ dharmu bhāṣase
abhūmi[r atra bālānāṃ yāvanta anyatīrthikāḥ // 12 //
ye sthitā ātmasaṃjñāyāṃ te skhalanti avidvasu
jñātvā dharmāṇa nairātmyaṃ skhalitaṃ te na vidyate // 13 //
bhūtavādī mahāvīra bhūtadha[rmapratiṣṭhitaḥ
bhūte satye sthito nātha bhūtāṃ] vācaṃ prabhāṣase // 14 //

. . .   . . .

ye sthitā ātma[saṃjñāyāṃ duḥkhe te suprati]ṣṭhitāḥ
na te jānanti nairātmyaṃ yatra duḥkhaṃ na vidyate // 24 //
askhalite pade dharme deśako 'si
skhalitu na labhyati lokanāthaḥ
[avitatha gira saṃprabhāṣase tvam]
duḥkhamokṣakarā namas te nātha // 25 //

. . . . . .

bhajyād iyaṃ mahī saśailaraṇā
kṣīyate sāgarajalaś ca tathā
candro 'tha sūryu dharaṇīṃ prapated
giram anyathā na puna bhāṣi jinaḥ // 91 //
sarvāṅga vākya pariśuddha girā, etc.

The sky together with the moon and stars could fall; the earth together with its cities and mountains could disappear; and even the element of ether could become otherwise - but of you a speech which is not so could indeed never be. // 9 //

You, having seen beings suffering, men intent upon a basis, teach the profound, tranquil emptiness without a basis // 10 //

. . . . . .

In what kind of dharma you are trained, that kind of dharma you declare. Here is no place for the stupid, up to: other non-Buddhists. // 12 //

Who are established in the perception of a self, they, the ignorant, falter. (But) having known the absence of a self of dharmas, for you a faltering does not occur. // 13 //

A speaker of what is, O great Hero, abiding in dharmas which are, established in what is, in the true, O Lord you declare speech of what is // 14 //

. . . . . .

Who are established in the perception of a self, they are abiding firmly in suffering; they do not understand the absence of a self in which suffering does not occur. // 24 //

(But) you are a teacher of dharma, of a way without faltering. The Lord of the world never falters. You proclaim speech which is not that which is not so - Homage to you, Lord, the deliverer from suffering // 25 //

. . . . . .

This earth together with its mountains and forests could be consumed; so also the water of the ocean could be exhausted; even the sun and the moon could fall to the earth - but the Jina could not declare a speech which is otherwise (than fact) // 91 //

(His) sayings are complete, (his) speech is pure, etc.

SR XXIX

At the end of a long account of his former meritorious deeds the Buddha says:

ye me kumāra kṛta āścariyā
 kṛta duṣkarāṇi bahukalpaśatā
na ca te maya kṣapaṇa śakya siyā
 kalpāna koṭinayutā bhaṇataḥ // 69 //
unmattacittabhūmi gacchi narā
 aśraddadhanta sugatasya carim
kṛta ye mi duṣkara tad āścariyā
 imu śāntam eṣata samādhivaram // 70 //
ārocayāmi ca kumāra idaṃ
 śraddadhanta me avitathaṃ vacanam
na hi vāca bhāṣati mṛṣām sugataḥ
 sada satyavādi jinu kāruṇikaḥ // 71 //

Kumāra, which were the wonderful things done by me, the difficult things done through many hundreds of kalpas - those could not be exhausted by me speaking for koṭis of nayutas of kalpas // 69 //

A man not believing in the course of the Sugata arrives at a state of distraction - it is wonderful the difficult things I have done seeking for this tranquil, best of samādhis. // 70 //

And I announce this, Kumāra. Believe my speech which is not that which is not so! Indeed, the Sugata does not declare a false speech; always the Jina, the Compassionate One is a speaker of truth. // 71 //

SR XXXVI

tasmāt kumāreha ya bodhisattvo
   ākāṅkṣate pūjitu sarvabuddhān
atīta utpanna tathāgatāṃś ca
   dhāretu vācetu imaṃ samādhim // 14 //
eṣā [hi] sā bodhi tathāgatānāṃ
   śraddhehi mahyaṃ vacanaṃ kumārāḥ
na bhāṣate vācaṃṛṣāṃ tathāgato
   na hīdṛśāḥ sattva mṛṣāṃ vadanti // 15 //

Therefore, Kumāra, which bodhisattva here desires to worship all Buddhas, both past and present Tathāgatas, he should preserve, he should recite this Samādhi[-rāja-sūtra], // 14 //

for this is the awakening of the Tathāgatas. Believe my speech, Kumāra! A Tathāgata does not declare false speech; not, indeed, do such beings utter the false // 15 //

SP Ch.II - the essential contents of which concern the fact of ekayāna:

22.8: gambhīradharmāḥ sukhumā mi buddhā
   ata[r]kikāḥ sarvi anāsravāś ca
aham vijānāmīha yādṛśā hi te
   yaṃ [rd. ye] vā jinā loki daśaddiśāsu // 18 //
yaṃ śāriputraḥ sugata prabhāṣate
   adhimuktisaṃpannu bhavesi tatra
ananyathāvādi jino maharṣī
   cireṇa so bhāṣati uttamārtham // 19 //

Subtle, profound dharmas were awakened to by me; and all are beyond reasoning and without outflows. I here know those as they are, as do the Jinas in the ten directions of the world. // 18 //

Śāriputra, that which the Sugata declares, you there (should) enter into earnest application. The Jina, the great seer is a speaker of that which is not otherwise (than fact). For a long time he declares the highest meaning. // 19 //

25.25: śraddadhata me śāriputra: bhūtavādy aham asmi tathatāvādy ahaṃ asmy ananyathāvādy aham asmi; durbodhyaṃ śāriputra tathāgatasya saṃdhābhāṣyam: 'Believe me, Śāriputra: I am a speaker of what is. I am a speaker of thus as it is. I am a speaker of that which is not otherwise (than fact). Śāriputra, the hidden meaning of the Tathāgata is difficult to understand.'

192.15: vyapanehi kāṅkṣā tatha saṃśayaṃ ca
yeṣāṃ ca keṣāṃcīha kāṅkṣa vidyate
ananyathāvādina lokanāyakā
ekaṃ imaṃ yānu dvitīyu nāsti // 70 //

For whomsoever a doubt occurs here, they should dispel (their) doubt and likewise any uncertainty: the Leaders of the world are speakers of that which is not otherwise (than fact): This is the sole vehicle. There is not a second. // 70 //

SP Chs. XIV and XV - which set forth the view that the length of the Tathāgata's life is without measure:

106.12: vicikitsa mā yūya kurudhva sarve
ahaṃ hi yūyaṃ parisaṃsthapemi
ananyathāvādir ahaṃ vināyako
jñānaṃ ca me yasya na kāci saṃkhyā // 35 //
gambhīradharmāḥ sugatena buddhā
atarkikā yeṣa pramāṇu nāsti

You must form no hesitations. I, indeed, will establish you firmly. I, the Guide, am a speaker of that which is not otherwise (than fact). I have a knowledge of which there is no calculation. // 35 //

Profound dharmas are awakened to by the Sugata, beyond reasoning and of which there is no measure.

107.27: [a]nāsravaṃ bhūtam imā mi vācāṃ
śruṇitva sarve mama śraddadhadhvaṃ
evaṃ ciraprāpta mayāgrabodhiṃ
paripācitāś ceti mayāiva sarve // 43 //

This speech of mine is without outflows, is of what is. Having heard it all should believe me ! Thus, for a long time has the highest awakening been obtained by me, and I have matured all these [countless beings]. // 43 //

108.26; Kern 312.6 [the Bodhisattva Maitreya responds to this saying]: kiṃ cāpi vayaṃ bhagavaṃs tathāgatasya [K: vacanaṃ] śraddhayā gamiṣyāmaḥ, ananyathāvādī tathāgata iti. [K: tathāgata] evaitam arthaṃ jānīyān, navayānasaṃprasthitāḥ khalu punar bhagavaṃ bodhisattvā vicikitsām āpatsyante 'tra sthāne, parinirvṛte tathāgate imaṃ dharmaparyāyaṃ śrutvā na pattīyiṣyanti na śraddadhāsyanti nādhimokṣyante: 'And moreover, Blessed One, we proceed through faith in [the speech of] the Tathāgata: 'The Tathāgata is a speaker of that which is not otherwise (than fact)'; surely the Tathāgata would know that. Bodhisattvas newly set out in the vehicle, however, O Blessed One, will fall into hesitations here in this matter; having heard this discourse on dharma after the Tathāgata has parinirvāṇed, they will not have faith in it, they will not believe it, they will not trust in it.

111.2 [The Blessed One responds saying three times]: avakalpayadhvaṃ [me] kulaputrā abhiśradda[dha]dhvaṃ tathāgatasya bhūtāṃ vācā vyāharataḥ: 'Have confidence in me, sons of good family ! Believe when the Tathāgata utters speech of what is !'

112.29: sarve te dharmaparyāyāḥ satyās tathāgatena bhāṣitā: nāsty atra tathāgatasya mṛṣāvādaḥ: 'All the discourses on dharma spoken by the Tathāgata are true. There is here no false speech of the Tathāgata'.

117.25: āyuś ca me dīrgham anantakalpam
samudānitam pūrva caritva caryām // 18 //
mā sa[m]śayam atra kurudhva panditā:
vicikitsitam ca jahathā aśeṣam
bhūtām prabhāṣāmy aham eta vācām
mṛṣā mama naiva kedāci vāg bhavet // 19 //

And my life-span is endless kalpas long, attained after formerly having practised the (religious) practice. // 18 //
You who are learned, do not form any doubt in this matter ! Dismiss your hesitations completely ! This speech I proclaim is what is. There could never be of me a false word.

If, as I have indicated above, *Bhg* responds to the implied criticism of its central assertion by unequivocally declaring that its authority rests on the fact that it was declared by the Buddha, and by the fact that Buddhas never declare 'that which is otherwise (than fact)', then these passages from *Vaj*, *SR*, and *SP* - and any number of others - indicate in turn that such a response is in no way unique to *Bhg*. And it is particularly important to note both the range and kind of assertions which appear to require this response. In *Vaj* and *SR*, for example, what are perhaps the central assertions of Bodhic Buddhism - nairātmya and śūnyatā - are "justified" on this basis and their truth-claim supported on this authority. So too in *SP*, what are perhaps its two most significant doctrines - ekayāna and the unlimitedness of the Tathāgata's life-span - base their truth-claim on the same authority. In short, for *all* these assertions the only pramāṇa is śabda, and the only response one of faith. *SP*, in particular, indicates that these assertions are atarkika, 'beyond reasoning'. All of this, of course, renders any talk about "a Buddhism of faith" rather dubious.

There is one other point to be noted in reference to *Bhg* [16], a point which is rather difficult to evaluate. We have seen over and over again that virtually all our texts - *Eka*, *ŚmD*, *Aj*, *StA*, *Bbp*, *Kv*, *SP* *SR* - assert that one or another 'blessing' follows 'from merely hearing or recollecting the name' of some Buddha or Bodhisattva or text. This

idea is firmly established and appears to have been taken for granted by all our texts - except for *Bhg*. *Bhg* is unique in presenting a 'justification', and the justification of a commonplace seems to be a curious occupation. The problem, then, is to decide what the anomalous position of *Bhg* vis-à-vis other texts can signify. Here I can only say that we might be able to detect a pattern in Mahāyāna Sūtra literature in which a doctrine receives either the kind of justification found at *Bhg* [16], or a 'detailed' explanation, only when it is relatively 'new' or in the earlier stages of its incorporation into the accepted body of teaching. This, for example, seems to be the case for the concept of the buddhānubhāva discussed above under *Bhg* [2]. If this pattern can be verified, then it may be that *Bhg* is older than it is usually thought to be. All of this, however, is only a suggestion.

[17]

And, again, at that time, in just that assembly, there was a Bodhisattva, Mahāsattva, named Trāṇamukta. He, having risen from his seat, having put his upper robe on one shoulder, having placed his right knee on the ground, having bent forth his folded hands towards the Blessed One, said this to the Blessed One: 'O Reverend Blessed One, in the last time, in the last period, there will be beings afflicted with various diseases, having emaciated limbs from long illness, their lips and throat parched from hunger and thirst, in the presence of death, surrounded by weeping friends and relatives and kinsmen, seeing darkness in all directions, being drawn away by the servants of Yama. The cadaver of such a one being laid out here, the consciousness is led into the presence of Yama, the King of Dharma. And the devatā born together with that person [1]*which followed behind him*[1]*, having fully written down that which would be the merit and demerit done by him, would present it to Yama, the King of Dharma. Yama, the King of Dharma asks about that; weighs it. As merit or demerit was done, so he issues a directive in accordance. (But) which [friends, relatives and kinsmen*[2]*] will go for refuge to the Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabha, the Tathāgata, for the sake of that sick man they perform pūjā in a certain way.*[3] *Now the case does occur where his consciousness could just return again (i.e. immediately). He (then) becomes aware of himself (i.e., of his experiences before Yama) as if in a dream. Or if on the seventh day, or if on the twenty-first or thirty-fifth or forty-ninth day his consciousness would be reborn again, he would obtain recollection. He himself (in either case) is a direct witness to (the effects of)*

merit, demerit, (and) the maturation of past actions. (As a consequence)[4] *even for the sake of his life he does not do an evil deed. For that reason, by a believing son or daughter of good family* [5)]*pūjā is to be performed to that Tathāgata.*[(5]

1) (1 X omits this. 2) Supplied from X, which clarifies the referent of Y's ye. 3) This sentence is constructed somewhat different in both X and Z. X: 'Then those friends, relatives and kinsmen, *would go* for refuge to the Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabha, the Tathāgata, for the sake of that sick man, *would perform* pūjā to that Tathāgata'; Z: 'which [friends, etc.] will go for refuge to the Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguru, by them, for the sake of that sick man, pūjā *is to be performed* in a certain way'. T uses the na or 'if' construction for the final verb. 4) X inserts at the beginning of the sentence: 'Having been born (?; jātvā), he, etc.' 5) (5 X: '... the name of the Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabha, the Tathāgata is to be preserved, and pūjā in accordance with one's means (?) is to be performed.

---

a. One point must here be dealt with immediately. First of all it will be obvious from the number of parentheses in my translation of the second half of *Bhg* [17] that the text here is somewhat vague. My translation, then, involves more than the usual amount of interpretation inherent in any translation, and I would not want to suggest that there could not be other possible interpretations. These considerations are important for two interrelated reasons: *Bhg* [17] is in many ways a key piece in the text as a whole and in the characterization of the figure of Bhaiṣajyaguru; and my reading of the passage appears to differ from that of virtually everyone else who has written on the matter. [I must add here that I am well aware of the way in which the text was used - and by implication, understood - in, for example, 8th century Japan, but that, of course, need not necessarily have a great deal to do with the meaning of the Sanskrit original, since the text most often used there was Hsüan-tsang's Chinese translation which has a number of significant elements which have no correspondents whatsoever in any Sanskrit Ms. or in the Tibetan translations (cf. under [18], end).] Dutt, Nanayakkara (*Encyclopaedia of Buddhism* Vol.II, 667), etc., all state or imply that the action described

in the passage is primarily intended to 'revive a dying man'. Now if this is not totally wrong, it is certainly a case of misplaced emphasis, a case of not being able to see the forest for the trees. First of all it is clear that the individual concerned is dead. The use of the term kaḍevara = cadaver puts this beyond any real doubt. Secondly, whatever the exact meaning of vijñānaṃ punar eva pratinivarteta, it surely does not mean what we do when we say, for example, of someone in a coma, 'he regained consciousness'. Vijñāna here almost certainly has a technical meaning, a meaning well attested even in our 'earliest' sources. Wijesekera says, on the basis of a study of passages from Pāli canonical literature: "In view of such evidence the conclusion is difficult to avoid that the term *viññāṇa* in Early Buddhism indicated the *surviving factor* of an individual which by re-entering womb after womb produced repeated births resulting in what is generally known as saṃsāra", that this viññāṇa "is no other than the viññāṇa which is regarded as the cause for the individual's survival after death" (O.H. de A. Wijesekera, "The Concept of Viññāṇa in Theravāda Buddhism", *JAOS* 84 (1964) 254-59; cf. his "Vedic Gandharva and Pāli Gandhabba", *University of Ceylon Review* 3 (1945) 73f. (esp. 92f); L. de La Vallée Poussin, "Dogmatique bouddhique, la négation de l'âme et la doctrine de l'acte", *JA* (1902) 270f.; Poussin, *Nirvāṇa* (Paris: 1925) 27f; R.E.A. Johansson, "Citta, Mano, Viññāṇa - A Psychosemantic Investigation", *University of Ceylon Review* 23 (1965) 189f. Passages at Gilgit which appear to be related to this technical meaning are *SR* XXII 19, XXXII 103, 106b, 123a; *Sgt* 2161.3, 2096.6, 2097.7; *Rkp* 195.4; most of these have already been quoted.) When this technical meaning is taken into account it changes the complexion of the entire passage. But even if we accept the fact that vijñānaṃ punar eva pratinivarteta might refer to the reviving of a dead man, the text itself makes it clear that 1) this occurs only after the vijñāna has been brought before Yama and been 'judged', and, therefore, undergone the central trauma of death; and 2) that this is only one possible, by no means certain, result of the pūjā. The second point is beyond any real doubt on the basis of the construction of the sentence alone: sthānam etad vidyate yat... yadi vā ... yadi vā. This same construction, together with the small change in the verb from pratinivarteta to nivarteta, and the change from ātmānaṃ saṃjānāti to smṛtiṃ upalabhet, also clearly indicates that *if* in the first case the reference is to reviving a dead man, we are

in the second case or group of cases dealing with something different. Again, I think there cannot be too much doubt that the second case or group of cases refers to a return of the vijñāna *in a new birth*. This is supported by the verb and the use of the term smṛti, as well as by the periods of time involved. It is highly unlikely that a cadaver would be kept for seven days, let alone seven weeks. The important point, however, is that it is not really important whether the vijñāna, after being 'judged', returns to its old body or whether it is reborn in a new birth. The text indicates that *in either case* the 'return' of the vijñāna is accompanied by an awareness of its experience, a direct awareness of the results of good and bad action. From this direct awareness, in turn, comes the rejection of evil action "even for the sake of his life". The reason, the primary intention for undertaking this pūjā, then, is to assure the acquirement of this direct awareness. And that this is the correct interpretation of this passage is, I think, supported by such passages as *Bhg* [7], *Bbp* 193-3-4 and *Rkp* 18.8 and what I have said of them above. [I will return briefly to this problem under [20] below.]

b. Apart from this we can note that *Bhg* [17] represents a clear case of the mythologization or anthropomorphization of the 'natural' law of karmatic retribution. But this, of course, is nothing new. It is already found at *Aṅguttara* i 138f. and *Majjhima* iii 178f (cf. J. Masson, *La religion populaire dans le canon bouddhique Pāli* (Louvain: 1942) 86-89; P.R. Barua, "The Conception of Yama in Early Buddhism", *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Pakistan* 9, no.2 (1964) 1-14; and for the same in a much broader context, J. Varenne, "La jugement des morts dans l'Inde", *Sources orientales* 4 (Paris: 1961) 207-30); and in addition to *Bhg* [17], the same phenomenon can be seen at Gilgit at *Kv* 275.29f and *Sgṭ* 2096.3f. I will not quote either of these passages, the first because it is clear that the Gilgit text, which is fragmentary, differed in some ways from the Nepalese text (e.g. the Nepalese text has atha te yamapuruṣā nītvā, but Gilgit (fol. 1597R) yasya dharmarājño purataḥ nītvā); the second because, going on for several pages, it is too long. In any case all these passages agree in essentials and present Yama as 'the judge of the dead'. But I think it is easy to make too much of such passages. If I am not mistaken, the 'mythologization' of karmaric retribution in no way affects the basic conception. It is, for example, the case in *Bhg* [17]

that the 'fate' of the individual depends ultimately not on a 'judgement' of Yama, but on the character of his acts. Yama simply declares the consequences of these acts, he does not 'judge' them. The 'judgement of the dead' by Yama in such passages is really only a dramatization of an otherwise somewhat abstract, impersonal concept. It involves, as far as I can tell, no real conceptual change. It is also worth noting that in a number of passages cited above in connection with the question of the importance of 'the moment of death', it is the Buddha, or a plurality of Buddhas, who appear before the individual and who declare the nature of his future state (*Kv* 306.33, 269.19; *Sgṭ* 1960.3, 1994.4). Here, in at least some sense, these Buddhas act in Yama's stead.

There is, however, at least one thing in the 'judgement' passage at *Bhg* [17] which, as far as I know, occurs nowhere else at Gilgit or in the Buddhist literature that I am familiar with. This is the reference to 'the devatā born together with the individual which follows behind him (puruṣasya sahajā pṛṣṭhānubaddhā devatā)' and who records his good or bad actions. Waley (*A Catalogue of Paintings Recovered from Tun-Huang*, p.xliv) says "many passages in Buddhist literature" refer to this "spirit" (or "spirits", since there are two of them in most of the texts he cites). But he quotes only two of the Chinese translations of *Bhg*, a Chinese commentary on the *Avataṃsaka Sūtra* by Ch'eng-kuan, and an apocryphal Chinese sutra entitled *Ti tsang p'u sa fa hsin yin yüan shih wang ching*, which is not exactly reassuring. For my part I can only note that we can find at Gilgit something to correspond to at least each of the elements of puruṣasya sahajā pṛṣṭhānubaddhā devatā. At *SR* XXI 17, Pek 303-2-2, for example, a king is dissuaded from committing an act of grave demerit by the tasya rājña anubaddha devatā / pūrvajāti sahacīrṇa-[so Ms. 2605.2]-cārikā / rgyal po de phyir 'braṅ ba lha mo źig / tshe rab sṅa mar lhan cig spyod pa spyad /: the devatā which followed ['was bound to'] that king, (and) had pursued the course [of life] together with him in (a) former birth(s).' At *SR* 473.3, Pek 12-4-5, a king whose kalyāṇamitra falls ill, has revealed to him in a dream the cure for that illness by anyatarā devatā purāṇasālohitābhud anubaddhā [Nepalese pṛṣṭhato 'anuvaddhā], lha mo sṅon snag gi gñen mtshams su gyur pa źig (yod de) / de rgyal po de'i phyi bźin 'braṅ bas: 'a certain devatā who had been an old blood relative (and who) followed ['was bound to'] him'. In both cases these devatās appear to have functioned very much like "guardian angels". In

addition to these passages we can also note that devas are elsewhere described as pṛṣṭhānubaddha in relation to an individual: *Rkp* 39.14: anekāni ca devanāgayakṣagandharvakoṭīnayutaśatasahasrāṇi tasya rājñaḥ kṣatriyasya pṛṣṭhataḥ samanubaddhā rākṣānuguptaye sthāsyaṃti; *SP* (Kern ed.) 288.10: antarīkṣāvacarāś cāsya devatāḥ śrāddhāḥ pṛṣṭhato 'nubaddhā bhaviṣyanti dharmaśravaṇāta; etc. Apart from these references I have not found anything else at Gilgit, and nothing at all even vaguely like the reference in *Bhg* [17] to the recording of the individual's deeds, although something like it is known elsewhere in India (e.g. the figure of Citragupta in the *Mahābhārata* and the *Purāṇas*).

Finally I might add that a comparison *and* contrast of *Bhg* [7], [17] and their parallels with the Tibetan Book of the Dead and other sources (M. Lalou, "Les chemins du mort dans les croyances de Haute-Asie", *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* (1949) 42-48; P. Poucha, "Das tibetische Totenbuch im Rahmen der eschatologischen Literature. Ein Beitrag zu seiner Erklärung", *Archiv Orientalni* 20 (1952) 131-63; P. Poucha, "Une version mongole - texte bilingue - du livre des morts tibetain", *Études mongoles* 5 (1974) 97-106; etc.) might very well prove interesting.

[18]

Then the Venerable Ānanda spoke thus to Trāṇamukta, the Bodhisattva: 'How, Son of good family, is the pūjā of the Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabha, the Tathāgata, to be performed ?'

Trāṇamukta, the Bodhisattva, said: ' Who, Reverend Ānanda, desire to effect the release from a great disease, by them [i.e. friends, relatives, etc.] for the sake of that sick man, for seven days and nights the obligation of the Uposadha possessed of eight limbs is to be undertaken, and to the community of bhikṣus pūjā and service is to be performed with food and drink, with all requisites, according to one's abilities; three times in the night, three times in the day, 1) *to the Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabha, the Tathāgata, worship is to be performed*(1*; forty-nine times this sūtra is to be recited*[2]*; forty-nine lamps are to be lighted; seven images are to be made; for each image seven lamps are to be set up; each lamp is to be made the size of the wheel of a cart. If on the forty-ninth day the light is not exhausted*[3]*, forty-nine five-colored flags are to be made (visible ?)*[4].

1)(1T: '...The name of the Blessed One, the Tathāgata Bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabha is to be fixed in mind.' 2)Lit. 'to be recollected'. 3)X inserts here 'it is to be known (that) all has succeeded'. Note, however, that Y in the next clause has a ca which is difficult to explain (I have not translated it). Its presence, however, creates no problems if, and suggests that, we should assume that Y had also originally read veditavyām, etc., and that it was accidentally omitted. But T, like Y, also omits it. 4)This is nothing but a filler. Although Y is easy to read and appears to have dṛṣṭikā, I have no idea what the intended meaning might be (the Ms. might also be read ddaṣṭikā, but that is equally problematic to interpret.) X at just this point is impossible to read clearly. T, if I understand it correctly, treats the final clause as a separate sentence

unconnected with the preceding clause, and makes it a kind of floating assertions: 'There are more than forty-nine flags of five colors'. I can only add here a further query: in light of X's xkta, and T's lhag par bya'o = (possibly) atiriktavya, should we be looking for a word meaning 'to be left' or 'to be left standing' ? This, at least, would make reasonable sense.

Bhg [18] provides us with a description of what *Bhg* [17] meant when it said that the friends and relatives of the individual perform, or should perform, pūjā "in a certain way". And once again there is a certain amount of ambiguity in the text. The ritual is addressed to those "who desire to effect a release from a great disease." But the curiously impersonal tone of this can alone suggest - in spite of the fact that these texts are not known for their literary niceties - that we have here a piece of metaphorical language, "the great disease" being the continued performance of unmeritorious acts. But however this may be, once again the periods of time involved make it very difficult to believe that the ritual was intended to revive a dead or even a dying man. The ritual takes at least seven days and its 'results' are not 'known' until the forty-ninth day. In addition to this there is no reference to a reviving or return to health as a consequence of the pūjā. As a matter of fact the text of X - and perhaps even the text of Y (see above n.2) - makes it clear that the 'results' of the pūjā cannot be directly observed. They are to be known by a 'sign', by whether or not the lamps that had been lighted continued to burn on the forty-ninth day. None of this, of course, makes sense if the ritual was intended to revive what *Bhg* [17] calls a cadaver. But even all of this is - if you will pardon a coinage - academic, because *Bhg* [17] has already stated what the results of the pūjā are: whether the vijñāna returns immediately or in forty-nine days, the result of the pūjā in either case is that the 'individual' is himself "a direct witness to (the effects of) merit, demerit, (and) the maturation of past actions", and "(as a consequence) even for the sake of his life he does not do an evil deed." He is, indeed, released from 'a great disease'.

* * * *

For a short note on "flags", especially on the curious expressions used several times in at least two of the Chinese translations of *Bhg*, Hsü-ming-fan (T.450), Hsü-ming-shên-fan (T,449), etc., "bannières qui prolongent la vie", see P. Demiéville, "Ban", *Hôbôgirin*, fasc. I (Paris/Tōkyō: 1929) 49-50. There is nothing in any of the Skt. Mss. or in the Tibetan translations to correspond to these "bannières qui prolongent la vie". We might also wonder if there is not some connection between the lamp of *Bhg* [18] and what in Japan is called chōmyōtō; cf. H. Durt, "Chōmyōto", *Hôbôgirin*, fasc. IV (Paris/Tōkyō: 1967) 360-65.

[19]

Again further, Reverend Ānanda, which calamities, foreboding natural phenomena and disturbances threaten anointed kṣatriya kings, whether it be harm from disease or harm through his own or another's army, or from asterisms, or asterisms and eclipses, or from wind and rain out of season, or from no rain at all - by such an anointed kṣatriya king a thought of friendliness is to be developed towards all beings; those imprisoned are to be released; pūjā such as that previously described is to be performed to the Blessed One Bhaiṣajya-guruvaiḍūryaprabha, the Tathāgata. Through this root of merit of that anointed kṣatriya king, through the excellence of the former vows of the Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabha, the Tathāgata, there will be peace and plenty in his realm; wind and rain and crops will come to pass in their proper season. And all beings residing in that realm will be free of illness, happy, and have much joy; and in that realm malignant yakṣas and bhūtas and piśācas do not ill treat beings; they do not see any bad omens. For such an anointed kṣatriya king there will be an increase of life, good color, strength, health and lordship.

---

a. *Bhg* [19] is a 'text' which probably forms a part of the Indian background to what in Japan came to be called chingokokka, "Protection de l'état" (J. May, "Chingokokka", *Hôbôgirin*, fasc. IV (Paris/Tōkyō: 1967) 322-37.) There are also other texts of this kind at Gilgit, a passage from *Rkp* being perhaps the most interesting.

Rkp 39.11-40.11: yaḥ kaścid bhagini rājā kṣatriyo mūrdhābhiṣikto janapadasthāmaprāpta imāṃ ratnaketudhāraṇīṃ pustake likhitvā dhārayiṣyati tasya rājñaḥ kṣatriyasya daśasu dikṣūdāraḥ kīrtiśabdaśloko 'bhyudgamiṣyati yāvad sarvaṃ rūpadhātum udāraiḥ kīrtiśabdair

āpūrayiṣyati; anekāni ca devanāgayakṣagandharvakoṭīnayutaśatasahasrāṇi tasya rājñaḥ kṣatriyasya pṛṣṭhataḥ samanubaddhā rākṣānuguptaye sthāsyaṃti; sarve ca tasya viṣaye kalikalahadurbhikṣarogaparacakra-vātavṛṣṭiśītoṣṇadoṣāḥ praśamaṃ yāsyaṃti; sarve ca duṣṭayakṣarākṣasa-siṃhamahiṣagajavṛkā anavarādhino bhaviṣyaṃti; sarve viṣatiktakaṭuka-rūkṣavirasaparuṣaduḥkhasaṃsparśavedanīyā doṣāḥ praśamaṃ yāsyaṃti; sarvāṇi cāsya dhanadhānyauṣadhivanaspatayaḥ phalapuṣpāṇi prarohiṣya(n)ti vivardhiṣyaṃti snigdhāni surasāni ca bhaviṣyaṃti. saced rājā kṣatriy(o) mūrdhābhiṣiktaḥ saṃgrāme pratyupasthite imaṃ ratnaketudhāraṇīpustakaṃ dhvajāgrāvaropitaṃ kuryāt sa rājā kṣatriyo mūrdhābhiṣiktaḥ paracakraṃ parājeṣyati. saced ubhayo rājñoḥ (kṣatriya)y(o)r mūrdhābhiṣiktayoḥ sa(ṃ)grāmābhirūḍha(yor ayaṃ) (ra)tnaketudhāraṇīpustako dhvajāgrāvaropito bhaviṣyati, tau parasparaṃ prītisāmagrīṃ kariṣya(taḥ). ity evaṃ bahuguṇānuśa(ṃ)seyaṃ ratnaketudhāraṇī.

Sister, whatsoever anointed kṣatriya king has obtained power over a people, and after having written in book form this *Ratnaketudhāraṇī* will preserve it, for that anointed kṣatriya king great fame and renown and glory will arise in the ten directions, up to: the whole world of form will be filled with (his) great fame and renown. And several koṭīs of nayutas of hundreds of thousands of devas, nāgas, yakṣas, and gandharvas will continue to follow behind that anointed kṣatriya king for the sake of guarding and protecting him. And in his realm all faults of discord, contention, famine, illness, invasion by foreign armies, wind, rain, cold and heat will be allayed. And all malignant yakṣas, rākṣasas, lions, buffalo, elephants and wolves will not cause harm (T: gnod par mi 'gyur). All faults to be experienced in conjunction with suffering from poison, from (that which is) bitter, pungent, astringent, tasteless and harsh will be allayed. And all his capital and grain, herbs, and forest trees, (and) fruits and flowers will grow up, will increase, and will be tender and juicy. If an anointed kṣatriya king when a battle is imminent would raise on the top of a standard a book of this *Ratnaketudhāraṇī*, that anointed kṣatriya king will defeat the opposing army. If this book of the *Ratnaketudhāraṇī* will be raised on top of a standard by two anointed kṣatriya kings who have met in battle, they will effect mutual satisfaction and concord. Thus, indeed, this *Ratnaketudhāraṇī* is possessed of many qualities and blessings.

[Cf. *Rkp* 144.11f; 156.1. For another example of the use of a text in battle cf. *GP* 141a.10 (text cited in *IIJ* 19 (1977) 140-41. The differences between *GP* 141 and *Rkp* 39.11 are interesting in that in the former it is not the presence of a book which protects the individual; rather it is said that one who *studies*, etc., the *Prajñāpāramitā* will, when he goes into battle, be protected.]

Apart from this we can also note:

ŚmD 94.9: yaḥ kaścid avalokiteśvara rājā vā rājamātro vā ... śriyā mahādevyā aṣṭottaraṃ śataṃ vimalaprakhyaṃ nāma stotraṃ dhārayiṣyanti tasya rājñaḥ kṣatriyasya viṣaye teṣāṃ sattvānāṃ sarvabhayetyupadravā praśamiṣyanti; sarvacoradhūrtamanuṣyāmanuṣya[-bhayaṃ] na bhaviṣyati; sarvadhanadhānyakośakoṣṭhāgāravivṛddhir bhaviṣyati; tasya ca rājñaḥ kṣatriyasya gṛhe śrīr nivasiṣyati.

'Avalokiteśvara, whatsoever king or royal authority ... will preserve the stotra named *The One Hundred and Eight Pure Praises of Śrī-mahādevī*, all fears, plagues and calamities for those beings in the realm of that kṣatriya king will be allayed. There will be no fear of robbers, cheats, human and non-human beings. There will be an increase in all capital, grain, stores and provisions. And Śrī will dwell in the house of that kṣatriya king.'

Bbp 194-2-3: de yi lus 'di la ni nad mi 'byuṅ
de'i rgyal srid kun la gnod mi 'byuṅ
khyim daṅ groṅ daṅ groṅ khyer źi bar 'gyur
gaṅ źig mdo sde 'di ni rtag 'dzin pa //

Whosoever always preserves this sūtra, here in his body a disease does not appear; in all his kingdom no trouble appears; homes and villages and cities will be safe.

[Note that in the series of verses of which the above forms a part there appears to be one extra pada, so my division may not be altogether correct. This, however, will hardly affect the sense.]

StA 75.12: yaḥ kaści rājā vā rājñī vā bhikṣubhikṣuṇyupāsakopāsikā vā dhārayiṣyanti satkariṣyanti likhiṣyanti likhāpayiṣyanti tathāgatagurugauraveṇa pratipattyā yathopadiṣṭāḥ pratipatsyante,

tasyāhaṃ bhagavan rakṣiṣyāmi, paripālanaṃ kariṣyāmi, yathocitaṃ varaṃ dāsyāmi, bhogaiśvaryair avaikalyaṃ kariṣyāmi, vivāda-yuddhaḍimbaḍamare jayaṃ kariṣyāmi, āyuḥsampadam upasaṃhariṣyāmi, tasya ca viṣayasya nagarasya paripālanaṃ kariṣyāmi.

Whatsoever king or queen or bhikṣu, bhikṣuṇī, or lay man or woman will preserve, will worship, will copy or have copied [this discourse on dharma; or 'these mantrapadas'], will put (it/them) into practice in the manner indicated with profound respect for the Tathāgata - I [Bhīmā Mahādevī], O Blessed One, will protect, will guard him. I will give him his choice in accordance with propriety. Through material things and lordship I will render him faultless. I will effect his victory in disputes, war, riots and uprisings. I will bring him accomplishment in life. And I will effect the protection of his realm and city.

On the basis of these passages and a few others like them it seems that we might make the following observations:

1) Ideas concerning 'the protection of the state' by means of religious activity were well known at Gilgit, but one gets the impression that they were 'floating', that they had not yet gelled into any definite pattern.

2) In the great majority of cases the religious activity meant to ensure the protection of the state was limited to activity directed toward one or another sacred text. The texts were to be preserved, copied, worshipped - even carried on top of a battle-standard. *Bhg* [19] is the only text which refers to anything like a specific ritual and even here there is some ambiguity. It is, for example, impossible to tell whether *Bhg* [19]'s tādṛśā kartavyā yathāpūrvoktā refers to the pūjā described in [14] or that given in [18]. It is, however, worth noting that in both pūjās the verbal component (i.e. the text) is prominent, and so even the more definitely defined ritual forms of *Bhg* link up with our other passages.

3) Regardless of their exact form, it would seem obvious that the ideas and activities connected with the protection of the state are both conceptually and structurally identical to the ideas and activities connected with the 'protection' of the individual. This is underlined

by the fact that both the pūjā of [14] and the pūjā of [18] are intended for the 'protection' of the individual, but in [19] one of these exact same pūjās is given for the protection of the state: the two are wholly interchangeable. In this regard it is also worth pointing out that *Bhg* [19] once again makes it clear that there is conceptually nothing magical about the process it describes: the activity involved is religious activity (pūjā); and the desired ends are effected 'through the roots of merit' of the king that initiates that activity, and 'through the excellence of the former vows' of Bhaiṣajyaguru. That is to say that the whole enterprise is governed by 'natural' or karmatic law. (This, of course, presupposes that I am right in thinking that conceptually, at least, once a 'vow' is vocalized, and once its conditions are fulfilled, the thing vowed has the effect of what we - rather ethnocentrically-call 'natural' law.)

4) Finally, May has noted in regard to Indian texts which were used in China and Japan for the purposes of protecting the state that "on ne sait s'ils ont servi [in Indian Buddhism] à des cérémonies de Protection de l'Etat". This, of course, may be true, but since the same could be said for almost everything else mentioned in texts connected with the actual practice of Buddhism in India, to follow this argument to its logical conclusion would reduce our field of study almost to zero. I can only say that on the basis of several colophons we do know that the Buddhist community at Gilgit seems to have had close relations with the ruling kings. Several of them are mentioned as the donors of our manuscripts and one of the manuscripts of *Bhg* may have been sponsored by a king. In another case a manuscript of the *Mahāmāyūrī* (cf. May, p.322) "was written for ensuring a long life for the king" (P.N. Cakravarti, "Hatun Rock Inscription of Patoladeva", *Epigraphia Indica* 30 (1953-54) 229.). This, I think, is good "circumstantial" evidence, but admittedly nothing more.

[20]

Then the Venerable Ānanda spoke thus to Trāṇamukta: 'How, O son of good family, can an exhausted life-span be once again lengthened?'

Trāṇamukta, the Bodhisattva said: 'Reverend Ānanda, was it not heard by you in the presence of the Tathāgata that there are nine untimely deaths ? On that account (i.e. for the cases of untimely death only) the use of mantras and herbs was specified. It happens that beings are sick, but their sickness is not serious. However, they are deprived of medicine or nurses, or perhaps the physician prepares what is not [the proper] medicine. This is the first untimely death. The second untimely death is: he for whom there is death by the authority of the king. The third untimely death is: those who are excessively careless, dwelling in carelessness, non-human beings steal away their vital warmth. The fourth untimely death is: those who die by fire and conflagration. The fifth untimely death is: those who will die by water. The sixth untimely death is: those who have died amidst lions, tigers, jackals, beasts of prey and wild animals. The seventh untimely death is: those who fall from mountain sides. The eighth untimely death is: those who die through the employment of poisons, kākhordas and vetāḍas. The ninth untimely death is: those who, visited by hunger and thirst, not obtaining food and drink, die. These, in brief, are the nine great untimely deaths declared by the Tathāgata; and there are innumerable other untimely deaths.'

---

a. There are a number of things we can note concerning this passage. The first concerns its overall character. It is, in fact, a general discussion (note the impersonal character of Ānanda's question) with no

necessary connection with Bhaiṣajyaguru. His name is never mentioned. It is here not presented as a list of the kinds of death in which his 'vow' is potentially operable. It appears, rather, as intended to announce the fact that there are certain kinds of death which are avoidable. And here again - as at [17] in regard to the effects of recollecting the nāmadheya - *Bhg* is unique vis-à-vis the rest of the literature. As we will see in a moment, virtually every other text at Gilgit (and this includes earlier portions of *Bhg* itself) takes for granted the fact that 'certain kinds of death are avoidable' and the list of the kinds of death falling into this category in these other texts are nothing more than variants of the list given here in *Bhg* [20]. Here again it seems that *Bhg* may be earlier than it is usually thought to be. Otherwise it is difficult to account for the fact that it makes a point of 'announcing' as the teaching of the Tathāgata what everywhere else has already been given or taken as such.

The second point is that this passage obviously has important implications for the question of 'reviving a dead or dying man' discussed under [17] and [18], since the essential purport of Ānanda's question seems to be exactly that: 'How can an exhausted life-span be once again lengthened?' Now if I understand the text correctly Trāṇamukta answers this question by saying, in effect, that it cannot be lengthened. He indicates that in certain cases - those called akālamaraṇa - 'the use of herbs and mantras was specified', i.e. in these cases death is avoidable. But in saying this he has also clearly said by implication that death by "natural" causes or disease which is guruka (and that described in [17] is certainly that) are not included in this category. They in fact are not avoidable and such a life cannot be lengthened. If I am right here this again makes the 'reviving' interpretation of [17] very unlikely.

Another point is that those cases for which 'the use of mantras and herbs was specified' are exactly those for which almost all the Gilgit texts 'specify' the 'use' of the nāmadheya of Buddhas, bodhisattvas and texts, the performance of pūjā, the recitation of dhāraṇīs, etc. The fact that *Bhg* [20] does not use the 'current' terminology, taken together with Trāṇamukta's question - 'was it not heard by you in the presence of the Tathāgata' - may indicate that *Bhg* [20] is either a quotation or a conscious echo of an earlier source.

* * * *

b. What *Bhg* [20] calls akālamaraṇas, *Bhg* [14] lists as 'fears' (bhayas), and lists under either one or the other heading are found almost everywhere. In looking at some of these lists we will here reverse our usual order of presentation and look first at some occurrences outside of Gilgit. We know, for example, from literary sources (*Sragdharā-stotra)*, inscriptions (one from Dambol dated A.D. 1095 [*Indian Antiquary* 10 (1881) 185], and one from Nālandā dated c. 12th century [N.G. Majumdar, "Nalanda Inscription of Vipulasrimitra", *Epigraphia Indica* 21 (1931) 97-101], and from images and reliefs (two from Ratnagiri, one from Ellora, and one in the Dacca Museum) that at a certain stage - say from the 8th century on - Tārā was intimately associated with what came to be known as the aṣṭamahābhayas. These 'eight great fears', never fully standardized, are basically the same as *Bhg* [20]'s akālamaraṇas. But we also know from literary sources (*SP* Ch.XXIV) and images and reliefs (at Ajanta, Kanheri, Aurangabad, Ellora, and Badami) that at an earlier period this same basic list of fears was intimately associated with Avalokiteśvara (for the details on all this see R. Sen Gupta, "A Sculptural Representation of the Buddhist Litany to Tārā at Ellora", *Bulletin of the Prince of Wales Museum of Western India* 5 (1955-57) 12-15; D. Mitra, "Ashṭamahābhaya-Tārā", *Journal of the Asiatic Society, Calcutta* 23 (1957) 19-22, 3 plates). On the basis of this material Mitra (p.22) concludes:

> "The profusion of the painted and sculptural representations of Avalokiteśvara in the rôle of a saviour that we come across in the caves of the Deccan leaves no room for doubt that the idea of deliverance from Eight Great Perils, which lead to premature death, originated with Avalokiteśvara ... With the introduction of Tārā who became the companion of Avalokiteśvara, some of the latter's active functions and attributes were completely absorbed by his female counterpart, so much so that in the later Indian sculptures and texts we find Tārā and not Avalokiteśvara in the rôle of the protector from Eight Great Perils."

The situation, as usual, is not so simple. We have already seen at *Bhg* [14] that those who perform pūjā to Bhaiṣajyaguru will be 'released' from the fear of fire, water, mad elephants, lions, tigers, bears, hyenas, venomous snakes, scorpions, centipedes, foreign armies, robbers and thieves'. Almost all of these have a correspondent in the various lists

attached either to Avalokiteśvara or Tārā. Add to this the fact that one or all of the same basic, and usually specific, 'powers' are ascribed to the *Ekādaśamukhadhāraṇī* and its recitation (*Eka* 36.3; 37.4; 38.1), to the preservation of the names of Śrī-Mahādevī (*ŚmD* 99.7), to the ritualized recitation of a dhāraṇī given by Vajrapāṇi (*StA* 57.10), to the preservation, etc., of *Rkp* (*Rkp* 155.8) or *SP* (*SP* (Kern ed.) 293.5; *SP* 158.25; 174.25; 175.22), to worshipping *Sgṭ* (*Sgṭ* 2122.3), to hearing it (*Sgṭ* 2141.4; 2159.7), to -interestingly - being established in patience (kṣānti) and dwelling in friendliness (maitrā; *SR* 334.2; XXIX 81, 106), to being practised in restraint of the body (śikṣitu kāyasaṃvare; *SR* XXXVIII 25-28), to behaving with complete purity of body (pariśuddhakāyasamācāro; *SR* 604.7), and finally, to taking up, studying, etc. the *Prajñāpāramitā* (*GP* v 1406.6).

The pattern which we see here should by now be familiar. What we see is, in fact, another good example of what at the end of my first note I called 'the process of generalization', the process whereby individual cases become only examples of a larger category, or where specificity of function is denied by assigning the same function to an ever increasing number of individuals. We also see here, as before, the nagging problem of the fear of death. We have, then, by any number of twists and turns arrived back at the point from which we started. The rest of the text requires very little comment.

[21]

Then in that assembly the Twelve Great Yakṣa Generals were gathered: the Great Yakṣa General Kiṃbhīra, the Great Yakṣa General Vajra, the Great Yakṣa Generals Mekhila, Anīla, Sanīla, Indāla[1]*, Pāyila, Māhura, Cindāla, Codhura, and the Great Yakṣa General Vikala, these Twelve Great Yakṣa Generals, each having seven thousand yakṣa followers, with a single voice spoke thus to the Blessed One: 'Through the power of the Buddha the name of the Blessed One Bhaiṣajya-guruvaiḍūryaprabha, the Tathāgata, was heard by us; for us there is no longer the fear of an unfortunate destiny. We all together, for as long as we live, go to the Buddha for refuge, we go to the Dharma for refuge, we go to the Saṃgha for refuge; we will be zealous for the benefit, advantage and ease of all beings. Especially the village or city or district or forest dwelling where this sūtra will circulate; or he who will preserve*[2] *the name of the Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguru-vaiḍūryaprabha, the Tathāgata; we will indeed protect those*[3]*; we will free them from all misfortune; we will fulfil all their hopes.'*

Then, further, the Blessed One gave his approval to those Great Yakṣa Generals: 'It is good, it is good, O Great Yakṣa Generals, that you, [[4]*remembering your gratitude to the Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguru-vaiḍūryaprabha, have set out for the advantage of all beings.'*

1) There are only eleven Yakṣa Generals named; cf. n.14 of the edition. I have not met this or any other list of twelve elsewhere. 2) T: '...who preserves and worships and honors...' 3) Read te[ṣāṃ] ca for te ca ? 4) From here to the end of the text we have only Ms. X.

[22]

Then the Venerable Ānanda said this to the Blessed One: 'Blessed One, what is the name of this discourse on dharma and how do I preserve it ?'

The Blessed One said: 'Now then, Ānanda, you should preserve this discourse on dharma as 'the Extent of the Excellence of the Former Vows of the Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabha, the Tathāgata'. As the '.... of the Twelve Great Yakṣa Generals ....' by name you should preserve it.[1]

1) T: 'Then the Venerable Ānanda, rising from his seat, having put his upper robe on one shoulder, placing his right knee on the ground, having bent forth his folded hands towards the Blessed One, said this to the Blessed One: 'Blessed One, what is the name of this discourse on dharma ? How is it to be preserved?'

The Blessed One said: 'Therefore, Ānanda, this discourse on dharma should be preserved under the name 'The Extent of the Excellence of the Former Vows of the Tathāgata Bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabha'. It should also be preserved under the name 'The Promise of the Bodhisattva Vajrapāṇi (Bodhisattvavajrapāṇipratijñā)'. It should also be preserved under the name 'Purifying All the Obstructions of Past Action and Fulfilling All Hopes'. It should also be preserved under the name 'The Promise (pratijñā) of the Twelve Great Yakṣa Generals'.'

Of the four titles given by T, X certainly had the first and almost as certainly the fourth; i.e. the gap after pra- could be filled thus: (pra)tijñā ity api nāma dhāraya. This still leaves room for another title of about 11 akṣaras. This could have been either T's second title or either half - but not both - of its third title. The presence of a title referring to Vajrapāṇi in the Skt. text would be as mysterious as its presence is in the Tib. translation, and therefore, perhaps, argues against filling our gap with T's second title. Hsüan-tsang's Chinese translation suggests it may have been the first half of T's third title.

[23]

This the Blessed One said. Delighted, Mañjuśrī, the true heir-apparent, and the Venerable Ānanda, and Trāṇamukta, the Bodhisattva, and those bodhisattvas, and those great disciples, and those kings and ministers and brāhmaṇas and householders, and the world together with its devas and men and asuras and ..... applauded the speech of the Blessed One.[1]

1) T: 'The Blessed One having spoken these words, Mañjuśrī, the true heir-apparent, and those bodhisattvas, and Vajrapāṇi, the Guhyakādhipati, and those complete assemblies, and the world together with its devas, men, asuras and gandharvas, rejoiced and praised the speech of the Blessed One.' Here again T makes reference to Vajrapāṇi and I suspect that both the reference here, and the one in [22] are connected somehow to the corresponding passages in *StP*. These passages in *StP* - with the exception of the first title in [22] - are almost exactly the same as those in the Tibetan translation of *Bhg*. In *StP* reference to Vajrapāṇi in one of the alternative titles is not totally inexplicable since he, at least, does appear elsewhere in the text, although not in any major role.

[24]

The Mahāyāna Sūtra named Ārya-bhaiṣajyaguru is completed].[1]

[1)] T: 'The Sūtra of the Great Vehicle named 'The Noble Extent of the Excellence of the Former Vows of the Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguru-vaiḍūryaprabha' is completed.

X alone of the five manuscripts preserves a title.